XAVIER
UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

GEO. A. FLORE CO.
LIBRARY
MAY 8 1970
BINDERS
CINCINNATI, O.

AVIER UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
HUMANITIES JAN 20 1970
HINKLE HALL

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

HALL

ON COMMUNITY LIFE ☐ Frederic M. O'Connor, S.J.

AN EARLY APPROACH TO UNDERSTANDING INDIAN RELIGIOUSNESS ☐ Patrick J. Ryan, S.J.

THE SUPERIOR'S ROLE WITHIN OBEDIENCE ☐ Mark Voss, S.J.

SIMON FOUCHÉ, S.J. ☐ Sr. M. Lilliana Owens, S.L.

THE JESUITS UNDER THE CZARS ☐ Denis Dirscherl, S.J.

DISCERNMENT AS A POLITICAL PROBLEM ☐ Michael Sheeran, S.J.

THE BUFFALO MISSION: 1869-1969

FALL 1969

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

The contemporary American Jesuit—
his apostolic works
his progressive involvement in the world
his response to the social issues of our day
his prayer and his use of the Spiritual Exercises
his living history
his formation for professional service—
these are the central concerns of WOODSTOCK LETTERS
a forum for positive thinking and expression
among Jesuits of the American Assistancy.

Copyright, 1969 by Woodstock College

Published four times a year: Winter, Spring, Summer and Fall

Entered as second-class matter December 1, 1942, at the post office at Woodstock Maryland, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Subscription: Five Dollars Yearly

WOODSTOCK COLLEGE PRESS
WOODSTOCK, MARYLAND
21163

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

FALL 1969

Volume 98 Number 4

INTRODUCTION

On June 11, 1969, the last Jesuit students left Loyola College and Seminary, Shrub Oak, New York, to take up residence on College campuses at Fordham and elsewhere. Opened in 1955, Loyola Seminary now only echoes the hundreds of student voices that once rang there. Spiritual Father at Shrub Oak, Frederic M. O'Connor spoke privately and publicly to the community of faculty and philosophers there from its first year to its last. We print here two of his conferences, given in 1961; both as a tribute to his decade and more of leadership at Loyola Seminary, and as a remembrance of the ideal of community Jesuits and Jesuit benefactors hoped to establish there.

We also print in this issue three historical articles: by Patrick Ryan, S.J., a doctoral student in Comparative Religion at Harvard University, who has previously and elegantly written for Woodstock Letters; by Denis Dirscherl, S.J., a doctoral candidate in Russian Studies at Georgetown University; and by Sr. M. Lilliana Owens, a Sister of Loretto from St. Louis, who is actively engaged in researching the history of her own congregation.

Also from St. Louis, and both students in the divinity school there, Mark Voss, S.J., and Michael Sheeran, S.J., contribute research work on the *Constitutions* and *Exercises* towards a better understanding of the role of the superior and change in the Society.

Thanks to Henry H. Regnet, S.J., the youngest survivor of the Buffalo Mission, we print here a composite memoir of the Mission's centenary celebration on July 13, 1969.

Owing to the relocation of Woodstock College from Woodstock, Maryland, to New York City, Woodstock Letters must, with this issue, suspend publication for the year 1969–1970. The Business Manager is already at work to refund those subscriptions already paid for that period.

G.C.R.

CONTENTS

FALL, 1969

INTRODUCTION

381 ON COMMUNITY LIFE • *Frederic M. O'Connor, S.J.*

393 AN EARLY APPROACH TO UNDERSTANDING INDIAN RELIGIOUSNESS • *Patrick J. Ryan, S.J.*

409 THE SUPERIOR'S ROLE WITHIN OBEDIENCE • *Mark R. Voss, S.J.*

425 SIMON FOUCHE, S.J. • *Sr. M. Lilliana Owens, S.L.*

435 THE JESUITS UNDER THE CZARS • *Denis Dirscherl, S.J.*

446 DISCERNMENT AS A POLITICAL PROBLEM • *Michael Sheeran, S.J.*

465 THE BUFFALO MISSION: 1869-1969

FOR CONTRIBUTORS

WOODSTOCK LETTERS solicits manuscripts from all Jesuits on all topics of particular interest to fellow Jesuits: Ignatian spirituality, the activities of our various apostolates, problems facing the modern Society, and the history of the Society, particularly in the United States and its missions. In general it is our policy to publish major obituary articles on men whose work would be of interest to the whole assistancy.

Letters of comment and criticism will be welcomed for the Readers' Forum.

Manuscripts, preferably the original copy, should be double-spaced with ample margins. Whenever possible, contributors of articles on Ignatian spirituality and Jesuit history should follow the stylistic norms of the Institute of Jesuit Sources. These are most conveniently found in Supplementary Notes B and C and in the list of abbreviations in Joseph de Guibert, S.J., *The Jesuits: Their Spiritual Doctrine and Practice*, trans. W. J. Young (Chicago, 1964), pp. 609–16.

STAFF

Published by the students of Woodstock College. *Editor*: Edward J. Mally, S.J. / *Managing Editor*: Gerard C. Reedy, S.J. / *Copy Editor*: Richard R. Galligan, S.J. / *Associate Editors*: Richard A. Blake, S.J., Alfred E. Caruana, S.J., J. Peter Conroy, S.J., James F. Donnelly, S.J., Paul L. Horgan, S.J., Joseph J. Papaj, S.J., Joseph F. Roccasalvo, S.J., Patrick H. Samway, S.J., Thomas H. Stahel, S.J. / *Business Manager*: Alfred E. Caruana, S.J.

ON COMMUNITY LIFE

man needs man

FREDERIC M. O'CONNOR, S.J.

ATMOSPHERE OF COMMUNITY

17 March 1961

"I give thanks to God, that he is always exhibiting us as the captives in the triumph of Christ Jesus, and through us spreading abroad everywhere like a perfume, the knowledge of himself. For we are the good odor of Christ unto God."

MODERN MAN is deeply aware of community. He freely admits that he needs other men.

But no one of mature judgment long reflects upon his need for others without soon discovering that communion among men does not thrive in every chance environment. Community, to be genuine and enduring, requires a favorable atmosphere: a clear air, a warming sun, a touch of spring.

Such an atmosphere of community may escape precise definition; yet men instinctively recognize its presence and detect its absence. No one watching Sartre's "No Exit" needs more than a glimpse of the faces and a few snatches of the dialogue to perceive that love could never be among that abandoned trio. Pediatricians tell us that infants are so sensitive to acceptance that they can sense its absence as soon as a pair of hostile hands picks them up.

But the presence of community is just as keenly felt. No philosopher at Port Kent last villa could have failed to benefit from the glow and welcome reflected from every face. More recently, I am sure, the cast and audience at our production of "The Tempest" hated to see the play come to an end, for a common endeavor, successfully carried out, has a stealthy way of drawing men together. Perhaps this same presence of communion explains the hidden charm of those haunting phrases of St. John: "Before the festival day of the pasch Jesus knowing that his hour was come, that he should pass out of this world to the Father, having loved his own who were in the world, he loved them unto the end."

An atmosphere of community, then, is as simple as sunlight. When it is present, it can't be missed; when it is absent, there is no substitute.

Four strong lines

If I were asked to describe an atmosphere of community in religious life, I should demand that it show itself along four strong lines.

(1) There must be such a sense of trust and understanding that a man can feel himself at one with other men. With superiors, first of all, so that a visit to a superior's room is marked by ease, manliness, and integrity. I mean an assurance that one has been oneself where most he wants to be his candid self. With his brothers, so that a meeting with them is a moment of spontaneous gratitude that he is privileged to live with such men.

(2) There must be such a tone about the house that a man is subconsciously drawn to imitate Christ poor, Christ chaste, Christ obedient to his heavenly Father.

(3) Such a sense of God's presence, registered and reflected in the walk, talk, and eyes of men around him, that he is impelled with ease to love his God, to love his image everywhere.

(4) Finally, such a well-founded realization that his brothers are proud of him, interested in his contribution to God's glory, that he is encouraged to attempt great things as he labors in his apostolate.

However, the more taxing problem to be answered is to determine how an atmosphere of community can be created. The question is delicate because there are false ways as well as solid ones.

It should be clear from the beginning that the solution to this important problem can be neither too spiritual nor too earthly; neither too heavenly nor too natural. For we are dealing with men, incarnate spirits in a material universe.

The valid approach certainly is not the facile enlisting of a public relations agency to enter our religious houses and assess our ills and pains. Although we might profit a great deal from such a searching operation, yet the goal we are reaching for is much too lofty to approach merely by tabulated statistics. Natural procedures have their place, but unity in Christ Jesus can not be counted among the wares peddled by Madison Avenue or its next door neighbor, Broadway.

Nor can the sing-song repetition of the formula, "Love one another," sacred though its meaning be, prove loud enough to sustain an atmosphere of trust. Words alone will never do. For when men live together upon an earth of clay, they need more than sighs and sounds to hold their bond together. And so, in the course of time, men have come to invent symbols and art, language and literature; for love itself must be creative and human relationships cannot long endure unless there is presented an experience to share, a challenge to mold. Even the sacred state of matrimony may be in jeopardy until a child arrives to divert easily sated eyes.

In religious life, therefore, a genuine and enduring atmosphere of community will be found only when due consideration is extended to the full human situation in which the dedicated man finds himself.

It is generally accepted dogma that, this side of the general resurrection, every man lives in a given situation. He is located in space, limited by time. As long as he dwells on earth, he must occupy a definite role, live out a particular status. If he lives in one country, he thereby becomes a foreigner to a hundred others. If he is a doctor, he cancels out a whole list of other professions as his life's work.

Now it is to be noticed that the more important human situations experienced by men are constituted in their full reality by two main elements: a basic structure and a deep immersion in time and space. The basic structure is the less tangible of the two, but still it is very

real and present. It enjoys a certain independence, for upon closer examination it precedes and antedates the full human situation itself. For example, it is quite evident that the purposes and general procedures of matrimony are somehow in existence even before the bride parades up the center aisle. And the recruit for the Marine Corps will be roughly awakened if he has dreamed he was signing up for an unstructured career.

More than structure

But a basic structure is not enough. No human situation is lived in the clouds (at least, we used to be able to say that). Nor is any valid way of life pie in the sky. Each human situation is incarnated in a real world, nailed down to earth. A hundred concrete circumstances support each life and a thousand fine details are pulled taut through every situation. Not every man marries Marilyn Monroe nor does every woman land the millionaire she once dreamed of. Every human situation is rooted in the particular.

The religious life, too, resembles all other human situations: it is structured, it is particular. Structured, since it is a complexus of vows and rules, common life and approved authority, a set way to dress and an established goal to strive for. This basic structure greets the young aspirant at the novitiate door; it will kneel beside his bed upon his death.

But the religious situation is particular also. For all its values and validities are rendered visible only by their incarnation in a human experience. Authority always means a definite superior to be obeyed; chastity the total response of a tempted or not so tempted man. The order joined is always one of many, formed with a definite spirit, encountered at a precise moment of its history, just so faithful to its founder's dream but no more. The members, too, the brothers in the Lord, are definite and numbered. Their names are posted underneath their napkin boxes, their laughs and voices soft or boisterous in the recreation room, their smiles as personal as their faults. Religious life is not lived in a vacuum nor in some far off Shangri La. It is stamped deep with the hallmark of everything human: it is particular.

It seems to me, then, that the search for community in religious life will have to be centered upon these two component parts of any human situation. A serious effort must be made to penetrate deep

into the very center and core of the religious state itself. Honesty must be employed, and boldness too. A daring confrontation with all the implications of the full human situation must be attempted. Either religious life contains the seeds of its own union and integrity or it does not. Either it has woven into its very fabric the strength and resiliency to become truly one or it has not. It is part of a man's full response to his own vocation to answer this most basic question. Perhaps the following reflections may help.

Many parts of the basic structure of religious life display a communal face that is not often seen. The individual side of vows and rules is heavily stressed, but their relation to the many is frequently neglected. Yet, religious life is presented by the Church so that men can live together, not endure apart. I cannot help but feel that our Holy Mother, Christ's Bride, with her usual wisdom and patience, has somehow forced into the very marrow of religious life a power to draw men into unity. I am convinced that everything prescribed, from vows to common board, from rules to prayer and work, holds at its core a secret hidden power which when released can make the members one.

Nor would this be too strange. For whenever men live together, by native instinct even, they invent institutions and tribal rites that can draw the clan together. Nations fly their flags, set aside holidays for parade and celebration, compose folksongs and national anthems, and even stir up foods peculiarly their own. If anyone views such universal customs with only a passing glance, he may miss the deeper truth lying within: when men live together, they need to sing the same songs, execute the same dances, and boast the same dress, whether it is a shamrock on a lapel or a beret on the head. If they don't, they will perish as a people. If human nature is so astute in holding its children together, will the Church, the mystical oneness of Christ, be denied equal care?

Poverty and prayer

But let us reflect on two definite items. First, the vow of poverty. This vow is difficult. It cuts deep like a sword. It strikes my independence. I can't do what I want because I can't get my hands on what I need. I find it truly a burden to follow Christ poor. I am not surprised. For I am human, too, and all the good things of the earth are dear to me. I can easily waver in my allegiance to a God-man

who is poor. But then I see you. You are living out your poverty. You come from a different background than I, and yet you appear so genuine in seeking leave for things you would have taken for granted were you not following Christ poor. You strengthen me. I see now that it is possible to live with Christ poor. I am not alone.

The prayer of a Jesuit. So much of our prayer is made by ourselves, so little together. But need our Jesuit prayer be so starkly and privately conceived? Is it not correct to say that we rise together, kneel upon our priedieus in our morning prayer somehow united with one another? Doesn't our solitary prayer have a communal power? Do we not stand at each other's side at Mass, and there become together the pounded grains of wheat, the gathered drops of wine with him who came to make all things one?

My dear brothers in Christ: let me close these reflections on community by relating the bold adventure of another group of men attempting community. The passage is from the talented pen of Fr. Broderick. The quotation deals with the weeks following St. Ignatius' ordination in Venice on June 24th, 1537.

"Ignatius and his disciples determined to leave Venice and seek seclusion for 40 days in places where they were not known.

"At Vicenza, they lit upon a house without the city which had neither door nor window, and dwelt therein, sleeping on some straw collected by themselves. Two of them went to beg in the city twice a day, but gained hardly enough to keep life in them. Their usual food, when they had it, was a little bread baked by one who stayed at home. They spent forty days in this fashion, giving themselves up to prayer and nothing else . . . Finally, they all began to preach, the same hour in the different squares of the town, first making a great outcry and waving their caps to call the people around them. Their preaching provoked much talk in the city and so plenty of food was bestowed on them.

"They began to pray and think what title would best suit them, and considering that over them they had no head but Jesus Christ, whom alone they desired to serve, it seemed right that they should adopt the name of Him Who was their head and that their congregation should be called the Society of Jesus."

The Society of Jesus—this is the secret of our union. This is the atmosphere of our community.

COMMUNITY

20 January 1961

"Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity."

This evening I should like to talk with you about community. You have lived in community anywhere from four to forty years. What is your opinion of it? What meaning does it have for you? Let me start with some experiences of community. The first is a young religious priest, a teacher in a college, intelligent, zealous, sincere. His views are rigid, his outlook somewhat jansenistic. He finds it difficult to get along with his fellow religious. They in turn find him distant and strange. Communication lapses; strained relations become more taut. One day, the young priest's room is discovered vacant. On the desk lies a note which reads: "I have had enough. I can't take any more. Don't try to find me."

A few years ago, a Jesuit priest was dying of cancer. Up till the very end he was able to live in his room. He was in constant pain, and as the torture deepened, his nerves became jangled. He could hardly sit still. He could not bear to be alone. One of the fathers made a pact with the stricken priest. "When you need some one, come to my room. The door is always open." The dying priest accepted and spent hour upon hour, daytime and night, sitting in that welcome room.

In a large house of studies, a young Jesuit lives with well over a hundred men, calls them his brothers, works at their side. Yet, they appear to him as strangers. He sits at table with them and fingers with delicate touch the cool peripheries of life. He enters the recreation room only to find barriers matching his own defences. He feels lost. He wants to flee the recreation period. Yet this is his community. This is his home. These are the brothers Christ has given him; the men he chooses in preference to all other persons. The young religious is perplexed. What is community?

Man needs man

No matter how you view community, one constant truth will stand out: man needs man. Walk around it, approach it from any angle, you will always discover: No man stands alone. Did one man ever

succeed in getting to heaven by himself? To answer such a question, search for the sinner who has managed to give himself sacramental absolution. Seek out the man that poured the saving waters upon his own needful head. No one goes to God by himself, but the supernatural history of every Christian is criss-crossed by a thousand lives. When you read of some celebrity entering the Church, be mindful of the conversations of friends, the chance remarks of strangers, the secret prayers, that paved the way to the sacred font. When you yourselves stand at the altar, newly ordained priests, bless in spirit the countless hands that led you to your day of ordination. No man stands alone. Every man needs man. For all the blessings of our faith, all the refinements of culture and civilization, all the modes of speech and achievements of education, have come to us because other men have lived. If God came to earth and repeated his question of early Genesis, "Where is thy brother?," modern man could truly say, "in everything I touch, in everything I am."

But to come to matters more close at hand. What about us Jesuits? Do we need one another? Our language seems to say yes, for we have a vocabulary all our own that is rich in expressions of warmth and charity. Our companions are our brothers, our superior is our father, our very life together is termed community, and one word is magic to every Jesuit ear: the Society. In our homes, the hearth is called the domestic chapel. We boast of our government being paternal; and some of the most significant passages in our Constitutions are those that remind us that the very first persons to benefit from our zeal and charity are to be the members of our own order. "Prius excolendi sunt domestici quam externi" wrote St. Ignatius. There is no doubt about it. We Jesuits need one another on paper.

But what is the reality like? What do our lives say? On this practical level of community, we Jesuits have little to fear. We are convinced of community. We desire its fulfillment. When intelligent men become persuaded of a way of life, very little can stand in the way of accomplishment. The one failure, however, that we Jesuits are quite capable of sliding into is this: we can lose our sense of community. Our awareness of others may dim. Our keen consciousness of the communal aspects of our life may become blunted. Now, almost every act in Jesuit life has a communal side to it, whether it

is something as significant as observing the rule or as routine as taking a shower. A religious does not wear his habit merely for warmth any more than he combs his hair solely from vanity. But the actions and usages of religious life, attendance at class, participation at the holy sacrifice, obedience and poverty, all carry within them a communal force and influence.

If awareness of community does become dim, we Jesuits can easily cease to view our brothers as persons and can unconsciously treat them as things. But our companions are not things; they are unique persons, special images of the Trinity, gifted with rare talents, deep feelings, delicate sensibilities and diversified dispositions. They are not things, and if they are so treated the whole structure and beauty of religious life will cave in.

Yet it is, I believe, this very failure to view our brothers as persons that prompts us, in griping sessions, to speak of superiors as if they were tower controls and not men in need of graciousness and Christ-like gratitude. The same loss of awareness also explains how professors, since they have been decorated with a Ph.D., can be expected to endure any criticism and still bounce back, like a jack-in-the-box, with a masterful class no matter what the co-operation may be. And surely nothing but a sleeping consciousness of fellow Jesuits as persons can suggest why students for the priesthood of Christ can pour into the ears of men vowed to God conversations and innuendos that weaken communal chastity in a way they shall never know. Community can never succeed without awareness!

Community, then, is complex and intricate. It cannot be learned haphazardly. It cannot be viewed casually. Let us together turn our serious attention to its challenge.

Not proximity

Right off, let me say this: community is not the same as proximity. For people can sit squeezed in a subway car, absorbed in their Daily News, and still be worlds apart. Nor does the one roof over a hundred heads assure the retention of warmth among persons. A hotel can be a mighty cold place. For that matter, black-robed figures can kneel inches apart at the sacrifice of unity without experiencing one erg of communal energy. Mere juxtaposition is not enough.

Nor must we be fooled into mistaking camaraderie for true com-

munity, for this error would be stating that community thrives only among the compatible, is joyous only in an atmosphere of the pleasant. True community is a little more vigorous, I hope, than to be restricted to a diet of fellowship and flowing beer.

Community is often identified with the presentation of common goals and common means. But even here caution must be exercised, since a mere aggregation can result from such a pooling of endeavors. Men can work alongside of others, even on a common project, without community being created. Our modern world is filled with such distant closeness. Look at the tellers and vice-presidents of a successful banking house. There are cages all around them. A teacher in our own schools, likewise, can pursue a common goal with others and use common means but all in solitary fashion. His spirit can be exaggerated individualism: "You do your work. Leave me alone and I'll do mine." His spirit can be withdrawal: "When 3:30 comes, my time is my own." Such a lonely figure will experience no felt sense that he is engaged with others in the fashioning of a dream, that these men he works with need him, not merely his presence and his muscles, but his smiles and nods and approval. A common goal and common means, encased in abstract definition, will never add up to community.

We come, then, to what I judge to be the distinctive and formative element in community. Let me call it the sense of sharing, the experience of feeling part of a glorious endeavor. "This is *our* goal," your brothers seem to shout to you. "We are out for it *together,*" you answer back in joy. A contact has been made, a communication sparked, a voice has been sounded, a word spoken. Not always audible but tangible and reassuring; not loud, but present and felt. A bond has been forged; a communion has been instituted in some such fashion as this: in the Russian novel, *Doctor Zhivago,* the hero has just returned home from the front during World War I to find Moscow, the city he loved, oppressed by hunger, terror, and despair. A small welcoming supper has been set up by his family and friends, at which a chance duck and black-market vodka were served. But for the doctor, the meal seemed a failure, a kind of betrayal. "You could not imagine," he reflected, "anyone in the houses across the street eating or drinking in the same way . . . Beyond the windows lay silent, dark, hungry Moscow. Its shops were empty and as for

the game and vodka, people had even forgotten to think about such things. And so it turns out that only a life similar to the life of those around us is genuine life, and an unshared happiness is not happiness at all. For duck and vodka, when they seem to be the only ones in town, are not even duck and vodka."

What else does sharing mean? It surely includes giving—the giving of our time and our patience, our ideas and talents, our concern and sympathy. For community ean not thrive unless there is an exehange of gifts, an exehange that is large and free from jealousy. Love everywhere abhors inequality and eommunity cannot close its eyes to individual needs.

But we all know from experienee that to give things is relatively easy. What hurts is to give one's self. And yet, eommunity demands that a man share himself, that he somehow give something of himself unto those with whom he lives. As long as religious are full willing to give their possessions but not themselves, there can be no community.

But it is torture to give one's self. By experience, by environment, man has learned to lock himself behind elosed doors, ereet defenses around his inner heart, paint them over with a mask-like self and present that faee to the world as what he is. The walls thrown up are thiek and high. The barriers of fears and doubts are strong and firm. It is painful to tear them down.

The task

To tear them down, to demolish the defenses, that is the difficulty: that is the task! For such a demolition eannot be endured without humility. Sueh a removal of barriers means a man must trust his brothers with his life; trust them to aceept him as he is, to still be on his side even when they view his lowliness, to love him even when they diseover his unlovableness. This is the real challenge of religious life and I do not believe it can be answered until the Jesuit learns to trust the men Christ has given him for brothers.

Let me add one final experienee of eommunity written in the form of a prayer by Fr. Teilhard de Chardin:

My God, I confess that I have long been recalcitrant to the love of my neighbor . . . I find no difficulty in integrating into my inward life everything above me and beneath me in the universe . . . But the other man,

my God, by which I do not mean the poor, the halt, the lame and the sick, but the other quite simply as *other,* the one who seems to exist independently of me because his universe seems closed to mine, and who seems to shatter the unity and the silence of the world for me—would I be sincere if I did not confess that my instinctive reaction is to rebuff him? and that the mere thought of entering into spiritual communion with him disgusts me? Grant, O God, that the light of Your countenance may shine for me in the life of the other . . . Savior of human unity, compel us to discard our pettiness and to venture forth, resting upon You, into the uncharted ocean of charity.

AN EARLY APPROACH TO UNDERSTANDING INDIAN RELIGIOUSNESS

Roberto de Nobili as Tridentine Jesuit

Patrick J. Ryan, S.J.

It is difficult being a white man today. After nearly five centuries of European and American political and cultural expansion over the third world, historical circumstances confront the more sensitive minds in the West today—admittedly, still the vast minority—with a sense of guilt. Joseph Conrad, in *Lord Jim* and "Heart of Darkness" saw, at the turn of the century, some of the horrors perpetrated by the enlightened West in Asia and Africa. Since then the image of the guilt-ridden white man who recognizes, albeit impotently, the harm done by the West in its subjugation of the colonial peoples has become more frequent in twentieth-century literature and life. It might even be argued that the rebellious generation born in post-Hiroshima America feels stained by a new original sin. They can no longer trust the prelapsarian optimism of their parents.

There were rare Western figures in earlier centuries who recognized at least some of the ambiguities of Western colonialism. Bartolomeo de las Casas stands out most memorably in his defense of the New World Indians. Nevertheless, the majority of Christian missionaries in the non-Christian, non-European world was made up of champions of both flag and cross.

Although not so clearly recognized as a critic of European colonialism, Roberto de Nobili—an Italian Jesuit in seventeenth century

India—provides another perspective on the problematic union of European culture with Christian missionary endeavor.[1] Coming to India in 1605, Nobili eventually escaped the Portuguese atmosphere of Goa, Cochin and the Fishery Coast and arrived in Madurai in 1606. There he was an assistant to an elderly Portuguese Jesuit, Gonçalo Fernandez, whose evangelical activities in this princely city of southern India had been thus far fruitless. Within a few months Nobili began to grow uncomfortable with the complete identification of conversion to Christian faith with conversion to Portuguese or *parangi* caste status. His study of Tamil language and thought brought Nobili to some startling conclusions about the then accepted practice of asking prospective converts: "Do you wish to enter the religion of the parangis?"[2] It would be inaccurate to call Nobili's reaction an anti-colonialist one in our modern sense. He was even a mild defender of the Portuguese nobility as opposed to the run-of-the-mill Portuguese colonial types.[3] But he did recognize a distinction between faith in Christ and the adoption of European culture.

In 1607 Nobili began an experiment which was to last for the forty-nine years of life remaining to him. Shedding the black soutane and leather shoes of the European Jesuit, Nobili began to live and to dress like an Indian *sannyāsī* (professional ascetic). Meanwhile he dedicated all his energies to the study of Tamil and Sanskrit religious writings. Eventually gaining confidence in the new languages, Nobili ventured to teach the Christian faith and baptized his first convert, his Tamil teacher, in 1607. Nobili's techniques were based on the root notion that Christian faith can be distinguished from any form of European culture, an astounding idea for a man of his times. This idea brought Nobili into direct conflict with his Jesuit superiors as well as with the Portuguese ecclesiastical authorities in India.

Nobili's distinguishing Christian faith from European culture did not go nearly so far as many modern thinkers would like. Many liberal Protestant thinkers and theologians would find his approach

[1] The best biography is Vincent Cronin, *A Pearl to India* (London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1959).

[2] Cf. André Rocaries, S.J., *Roberto de Nobili, S.J. ou le "Sannyasi" chrétien* (Toulouse: Editions Prière et Vie, 1967), p. 129. This book contains a brief biography followed by French translations from Nobili's correspondence and Tamil theological writing.

[3] Cf. Rocaries, pp. 125–6, n. 15.

to the subject quite constricted by what they might call a narrow dogmatism. Nobili was quite certain that a basically realistic world-view must go hand in hand with the Christian kerygma. Nevertheless, Nobili was willing to go much further than many of our contemporary theologians who want to de-Hellenize Christianity in order to bring some hypothetical Hebraic or even culture-free core into conjunction with contemporary varieties of civilization. Nobili was willing not only to talk and to theorize but to stake his own body, his own life and personality on the attempt to be a Catholic Christian *sannyāsī*.

Humanly speaking, Nobili's experiment would never be totally successful. He was thirty years old when he began to live as a *sannyāsī*, and there were inevitable compromises which he found necessary to introduce into his style of life. Nonetheless, the abuse and calumny which Nobili suffered at the hands of Jesuits and other Europeans because of this style of life indicate that he certainly struck them as a cultural and religious traitor. Rumors circulated among his friends in Europe that he had renounced the faith and become a Hindu. Tried and effectively condemned by a stacked inquisitorial court in Goa in 1618, Nobili was not vindicated until in 1623 Pope Gregory XV overruled the petty jealousies of the Portuguese in India and approved his various acculturations of Christian faith.

Nobili's teaching and activity will be examined more in detail in the second section of this essay, especially with regard to social structure and philosophical-theological speculation. Nobili's understanding of society and thought in seventeenth century India, although limited, would seem to make him the first European to try to understand India somewhat on its own terms. There is no denying that Nobili rejected much that was essential to Indian culture and yet, paradoxically, hoped to keep his Christian converts from cultural alienation. There is a sociological naiveté to his hope to change only the religious component in the convert's culture. Also, there is no doubt that his intellectual debates with Brahmins were aimed at their conversion, not his own. The modern sensibility may be appalled at Nobili's desire for converts—perhaps an indication of how deeply ingrained are the uncertanties of the modern sensibility. The second section of this paper is meant neither to defend nor impugn

Nobili's aims or methods. Rather, it seeks to discover from the partial sources available to us in European languages how well Nobili understood some aspects of Indian life and religiousness.

Before beginning this inquiry, however, it seems best to sketch the European intellectual setting from which Nobili came to Madurai and how it affected his ability to understand the Indian situation. A concluding section will deal briefly with some contemporary reflections on the significance of his career today.

Tridentine origins

Roberto de Nobili was born in a titled family in papal Rome of 1577, sixty years after Martin Luther published his ninety-five theses on indulgences and fourteen years after Roman Catholicism finished redefining the main tenets of doctrine challenged by the Reformation. This redefinition-of-self, the Council of Trent (1545–1563), together with the Society of Jesus, which Nobili entered in 1596, were the main formative influences in shaping the Catholicism of Roberto de Nobili. These Tridentine and Jesuit influences on Nobili must be spelled out in some detail if his career in India is to be understood.

The Rome in which Nobili grew up was not the modern capital of Italy but rather the focal city, only recently challenged as such, of western Christianity. In the wake of the Council of Trent, Rome was experiencing a rebirth of theological and cultural energy which was evolving what we now call baroque Catholicism. The northern European schooled in the cool beauty of Gothic cathedrals or the American brought up to admire the chaste simplicity of Congregational architecture may suffer culture shock even today on visiting the baroque churches of Rome. The Jesuit churches of the Gesu and Sant' Ignazio, to say nothing of Saint Peter's Basilica, seem to the foreign visitor more dens of thieves than houses of prayer. Instead of hints of spirit, there is a flamboyant underlining of matter evidenced everywhere. Statues abound in a lifelike marble nudity or wind-lashed drapery. The cross does not stand starkly simple to confront the sinner; instead, gilded bursts of metallic light stream from its center while cavorting saints and angels point it out with elegantly turned hands. The simple table of the Lord's Supper has been transformed into a high altar of sacrifice, raised on several

platforms, crowned by layers of statuary, candles, nooks, niches and other distractions.

Baroque Catholicism is a resounding artistic counter-challenge to the Protestant Reformation. Where the Reformers had tended to emphasize man's radical inability as man to know God without the absolutely unmerited gift of faith, the Counter-Reformation spearheaded by the Jesuits was accused, even within Catholicism, of semi-Pelagianism, overconfidence in man's ability to grasp God. Where the Reformers had spurned the superstitious rites of the seven sacraments and even more of the sacramentals (indulgences, relics, pictures, statues, blessed water, etc), Roman Catholicism in the wake of Trent gave the latter even more conscious importance than they had before. Where the Reformers had replaced the centrality of sacramental ritual with the vernacular bible, Roman Catholicism responded with a new emphasis not on the scriptures but on the oral tradition of the Church.

With this Catholic patrimony Roberto de Nobili arrived in India in the early seventeenth century. The Council of Trent gave him the words and baroque Catholicism the feeling for human ability to know God. In rejection of what Trent construed as Luther's insistence on the essential sinfulness of even the baptized Christian, the Council distinguished the remains left by original sin, concupiscence, from the sin itself.[4] Basically this Catholic definition took a less serious view of the ravages of original sin on man's being as a whole than did many of the Reformers, and especially Luther. Catholicism and Lutheranism divide at this point historically: on how seriously man's nature and its capabilities—and more especially its ability to know God—are affected by sin. In many ways Kant is the secularized lineal descendant of Luther in his skepticism about any metaphysics; Catholic essays in 'natural theology' are the product of Trent, and later of Vatican I.

The practical results of this Tridentine teaching and consequent Catholic attitude on Nobili's approach to Indian religiousness were profound. While Francis Xavier, Nobili's theologically unsophisti-

[4] Cf. A. Denzinger et A. Schönmetzer, S.J., eds., *Enchiridion Symbolorum, Definitionum et Declarationum De Rebus Fidei et Morum*, 32nd ed. (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1963) 1515, 1521. Further references to it will simply appear as DS and the appropriate paragraph number.

cated predecessor in the Asian missions, was not at all adverse to describing pagan religions as devil worship, Nobili was unwilling to be so negative. He wrote, in a Tamil essay on evangelical method: "Without setting forth the true religion, nor yet proving that the others are false, there are some who start off from 'go' by declaring that the gods of these religions are demons and that the path which they teach leads to hell. This is insult, not preaching or proof at all. Injury of any kind cannot constitute a means of teaching the true religion."[5]

Furthermore, Nobili was willing to argue 'natural theology' with his visitors, such as his Śaivite Tamil teacher. He takes it for granted that he and the Śaivite are talking about the same reality known as such when they say 'God'. He wrote of this discussion in a letter to his superiors in Rome:

> The philosophers of this country, starting from the principle that nothing is produced by nothing, admit three eternal things: pati, paśu, paśa. Pati is God, paśu is the matter from which God made souls, paśa the matter from which he forms the body. I confronted him with the ordinary arguments of philosophy to prove that if paśu were not created, it would be God. Then I demonstrated that if pati could not create or draw out of nothingness, then it was not all-powerful, and, as a consequence, it was not God, since its activity, like that of secondary courses, was limited to modifying forms.[6]

The fact that Nobili was willing to begin with philosophical discussion of God—God as available to man's natural reason independent of biblical revelation—is an indication of the confidence typical of baroque Catholicism with regard to man's natural powers. Luther's castigation of Aristotle has no counterpart in Nobili's baroque Catholic acceptance of the validity of non-biblical philosophical speculation about God. To be sure, Nobili did not accept Śaivite doctrine intact, but it is most significant that he was willing to enter into philosophical dialogue with it.

Sacramental universe

The Tridentine intellectual background manifests itself not only in this confidence in man's ability to reason to certain truths about

[5] Rocaries, p. 213.
[6] Rocaries, p. 144.

God, but also in a confidence in the concretization of man's dealings with God and God's dealings with man in the sacraments and sacramentals. Luther and Calvin rejected the five non-biblical sacraments which had developed within Christianity over many centuries. Even more vehemently they denounced the sacralization of so many ordinary realities (the sacramentals) as idolatry. All of this was for the Reformers the product of human imagination, the idol-factory, a forcing of God into human molds.

Trent, in contrast, made explicit much that was previously undefined because unchallenged. The Council would not allow the symbolism of the sacraments to be reduced to "mere symbolism" in any proto-rationalist sense.[7] The sacramentals, although not accorded as much attention as the sacraments, were nonetheless defended in one of the last sessions of Trent, albeit with due recognition that much abuse and superstition had crept into these usages. Statues and pictures of Christ and the saints "are to be kept with honor in places of worship especially; and to them due honor and veneration is to be paid—not because it is believed that there is any divinity or power intrinsic to them for which they are reverenced, nor because it is from them that something is sought, nor that a blind trust is to be attached to images . . . ; but because the honor which is shown to them is referred to the prototypes which they represent."[8]

When Nobili came out of this Tridentine Catholic atmosphere to South India, he was not as repelled by Śaivite and Vaiśnavite ritual and imagery as a Protestant of his generation might have been. He showed himself not at all adverse to transforming Śaivite rituals peculiar to Madurai, such as the boiling of rice in milk in the presence of an image of Śiva at the festival of Pongal. He wrote to his provincial that "I allow our Christians to cook their rice and boil their milk at the foot of a Cross which they plant for that purpose and, to their great satisfaction, I myself bless the new rice which is to be used in that ceremony."[9] However, Nobili was constantly concerned to prevent a superstitious misapprehension of the meaning of Catholic images. For this reason he would not admit the merely curious into his chapel nor erect a cross outside of it, a practice

[7] Cf. DS 1616.
[8] DS 1823.
[9] Cited in Cronin, p. 116.

which further increased the Portuguese suspicion that he was beginning a new religion of his own in India. Nobili wrote in his Tamil work *Tūshana Tikkāram* that non-Christians "brought into the churches of the true God and seeing for themselves the statues displayed as symbols of great truths, . . . will consider these sacred objects the equivalent of his idols and will adore them as he adores his gods."[10] Nobili's sympathy for an image-oriented cultural religiousness apparently did not extend to its unconverted original forms, especially when these might lead to an easy Hindu-Christian syncretism.

The final Tridentine aspect of Nobili's background which may at least negatively have affected his approach to India was Trent's rejection of the Protestant insistence on the absolute centrality of the bible in the church. Nobili showed no noticeable concern to translate the bible into Tamil or to impose biblical names, culture or verbal formularies on his new converts. The curiously Hebraic culture developed by many new Christians under the influence of Wycliffite evangelism seems to have been lacking in the Catholic community of seventeenth century Madurai. For them Christianity was the *Jnāna Veda* taught by the guru whom they called Tattuva Bodhakar.[11] In this emphasis on Christian doctrine not as the contents of a written scripture but as teaching handed on from master to disciple Nobili reflects not only Indian religious traditions but the Tridentine stress on oral tradition as more inclusive than *sola scriptura*.[12]

Jesuit background

The Jesuit background of Roberto de Nobili, and more particularly his situation as a member of a minority of Italian Jesuits in a Portuguese Jesuit province, must not be ignored in the study of how Nobili was able to live for nearly half a century as a *sannyāsī*, and from this vantage point to approach the understanding of Indian religiousness.

Ignatius and his followers have traditionally concentrated most of their attention on man's cooperation with God's grace rather than

---

[10] Rocaries, p. 211.
[11] Cf. Cronin, *passim*, esp. pp. 67, 151, 267.
[12] Cf. DS 1501.

on God's overwhelming power. Ignatius took a gracious God for granted and concentrated on perfecting the human servant. The indifference he urged was to be a dynamic predisposition to take whatever honest means prove more useful for attaining the ends desired, a pragmatism of the spiritual life. The meditations on the Kingdom of Christ, the Two Standards, the Three Classes of Men, and Three Modes of Humility mold this indifference to positive preference for union with Christ himself in his suffering and death.

It can hardly be claimed historically that Jesuits are any more Christ-like than other Christians or human beings. But their Jesuit ideals, as formulated in the Spiritual Exercises, may well give some clue as to how and why they acted in one or another way. In this instance these ideals may help to explain the extraordinary ability of Roberto de Nobili to plunge himself into another culture and a new manner of religiousness as few of his contemporaries did. Nobili was sufficiently indifferent to his own baroque Italian version of Catholicism and sufficiently attached to his vision of the self-emptying of Christ as to embrace with apparent calm the ascetic life of an Indian *sannŷasī*, the reproaches of nearly all his fellow Europeans, the reputation of either an apostate or a madman.

The above-detailed spiritual motivation of Nobili should not, however, be overemphasized to the exclusion of a natural assistance from his Italian aversion to the Portuguese with whom he lived. It is always the privilege of a third party to be critical. As an Italian in the Portuguese-run ecclesiastical structure of India, Nobili was well able to see the cultural imperialism of the Europeans involved. One may speculate whether he would have been quite so perspicacious in a hypothetical Italian colony in India.

In any case, Nobili and his older Italian contemporary, Matteo Ricci, who became a mandarin in the 1590's in China, are prime examples of an inventive and dynamically "indifferent" generation of Jesuits. Their propensity to adopt whatever cultural means deemed necessary to achieve their ends has contributed, perhaps, to the seemingly ineradicable reputation for unscrupulous craftiness—jesuitry—attached to the name of the Society of Jesus. Arnold Toynbee, however, has a more positive appreciation of their attempts "to purge our Christianity of its Western accessories":

> The Jesuits were, of course, highly cultivated men. They were masters of

all the resources of Western Christendom, which, by that time, was a highly cultivated civilization. And, when they came upon the civilizations of China and India, they were able to appreciate the fact that here they were in the presence of great cultures, which, on the secular side, were built upon different foundations from the Western culture—upon different philosophies, for instance. . . . The Jesuit missionaries realized that the Greek terms in which Christianity had been expressed from the time of the Roman Empire onwards were not the best terms for making it acceptable to the minds and the hearts of Chinese and Indians. So they deliberately set themselves to divest their Christianity of its Western and Graeco-Roman accessories and to put it to the Chinese and the Indians in their own terms.[13]

This sanguine estimate of Toynbee's may go beyond the evidence in the case of Nobili, at least, and take in more the facts surrounding the late seventeenth century Jesuits involved in the famous controversy over the Chinese Rites. Nonetheless, Ricci and Nobili were the beginners of that amazing century of Jesuits who came from Europe to Asia to teach and stayed to learn.

Indian social structure

It is indeed unfortunate that the great bulk of Nobili's writings are not as yet available in translation into European languages. A definitive study of his understanding of the Indian culture which he encountered in seventeenth century Madurai can only be made by those proficient in Tamil and Sanskrit. His unpublished letters in Italian and Latin, preserved in the Roman Archives of the Society of Jesus, have been widely quoted in Cronin's biography and Rocaries' selection from his writings. These latter French excerpts from Nobili's Tamil *Gnanopadesam* and *Tūshana Tikkāram* give some idea, however, of Nobili's understanding of social structure and philosophical-theological thought in seventeenth century Madurai. From these very partial sources a tentative sketch at least may be made.

In view of the more recent history of India, in which Gandhi rose to world prominence not only for his non-violent politics of independence but also for his ceaseless efforts to abolish untouchability, the modern observer might at first be shocked by the readiness with

[13] A. J. Toynbee, *Christianity among the Religions of the World* (New York: Scribner's, 1957), pp. 92–3.

which Nobili accepted the caste system as he found it in India. Such shock would be an unhistorical reaction, rather like blaming the biblical authors for geocentric thinking. Nobili came from a comparatively rigid social structure in Europe and could recognize some hierarchical forms—albeit without the built-in equalizer of *saṁsāra* (transmigration of souls)—as intrinsic to society.

What did disturb Nobili was the low rank in the caste system assigned to the European Christians who had come for commerce, conquest or converts to India. This largely Portuguese group was labelled *parangis* and the highly cultivated Indians found them uncouth, as indeed they very likely were. They and all who followed them were rated very low or even outside the caste system. Nobili realized that much more than faith in Christ was being demanded of the prospective converts when they were asked if they wished to enter the religion of the *parangis*. Without denying the possibility of *parangis* being Christians, Nobili insisted that he himself was not a *parangi*, but rather a *rājā* who had become a *sannyāsī*, his translation of an Italian noble who had become Jesuit. Against calumniators Nobili insisted on this self-definition, made to the chagrin of his non-noble, non-Italian fellow Jesuits:

> I am not a parangi, I was not born in the land of the parangis and I have nothing to do with their race—God is my witness! If anyone can prove that I am lying, beside the fact that I then would become a traitor to God and deserve the pains of hell, I submit myself ahead of time to all the punishments I incur on earth. I was born in Rome, where my family holds the rank which in this country belongs to noble rajas. From my youth I embraced the sannyasī state, having studied wisdom and the holy spiritual law. I left my country, travelled over many kingdoms and came to Madurai.[14]

When the Portuguese Jesuits reacted vehemently to Nobili's separatism—he would only receive them reluctantly in his dwelling and then by night—his style of life came in for severe criticism both in India and in Europe. Nobili valiantly and repeatedly explained that he was still teaching the same Christian faith to his converts but that he was also trying to prevent them from losing caste. He detailed at some length how low in the Indian system *parangis* were accounted:

> In Tamil the word (parangi) cannot express the meaning of religion or

[14] Rocaries, p. 152.

race.[15] It signifies, in fact, the sickness we know under the name of *morbus gallicus*. . . . It cannot here signify the name of Christian . . . Actually, they even doubt that the parangis have a God or a religion . . . The Nayak (prince of Madurai) one day invited a parangi to examine his horses. This parangi was late in arriving because it was a Sunday and he had to attend Mass. Quite amazed, the Nayak asked his Brahmins what this could mean. Do the parangis have a religion and worship a god? One of the professors in his entourage replied to this: "O Nayak, do not be surprised: every barbarian, no matter how stupid a people may be, adores a god." Such was the opinion, then, in the royal court about the religion of the parangis. I am then correct in asking if in Madurai parangi means Christian.[16]

Nobili hoped as a *sannyāsī*, somewhat outside the ordinary norm of the social order and yet able to deal with members of all the higher castes, to bring men to Christ without also bringing them to the King of Portugal. In 1640 Nobili urged two other Jesuits to undertake a separate mission among outcastes. Nobili did not feel it was his role as a foreigner to change the social structure of Madurai. There is no doubt that his theological polemic against *samsāra* and karmic retribution would have eventually effected social change, if Christianity were ever to become a mass movement. But Nobili was pre-sociological and could not have foreseen this. Perhaps Nobili was attempting an impossible integration of Christianity into the Indian social structure at Madurai. In any case, even his quixotic plans were motivated by the primal element of genuine sympathy for Indian culture which may well be the prologue to true understanding.

Indian thought

Nobili's typically Jesuit approach to questions of philosophical and theological truth was the disputation. One example available to us in French translation from the *Gnanopadesam* is Nobili's discussion of the significance of the *Trimūrti*. R. C. Zaehner notes that this so-called Indian trinity is a theological arrangement meant to satisfy varying sectarian claims: "Brāhmanism . . . can absorb almost anything into itself, and so the rivalry between Śiva and Vishnu was

---

[15] There seems to be some contradiction between the use of the word 'race' in this quotation and that in the last.

[16] Rocaries, pp. 126–7.

resolved by the creation of a largely artificial *Trimūrti* or 'One God in three forms', Brahmā-Vishnu-Śiva, a trinity in which Brahmā is the creator, Vishnu the preserver, and Śiva the destroyer. This compromise was, however, without effect on popular religion, and Hindus are to this day worshippers of either Vishnu or Śiva or Śiva's śakti, each of which their devotees regard as the supreme Being."[17]

Popular or not, the *Trimūrti* has appealed to more than one Christian as a possible intuition into the Trinity of God the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. Nobili may be the first student of Indian religiousness to undertake the task of disabusing others of this easy comparison. The context is not so much a negative assessment of Indian religious ideas as a positive description of the Christian mystery of the Trinity. It may strike us today that Nobili's negative evaluation of the *Trimūrti* is excessive, however, and that his understanding of Indian religion may be severely limited precisely by his Jesuit habit of disputatious controversialism.

> If we study attentively their doctrine . . . on the Trimūrti, we can justly say that these idols are not God, but three creatures, and there is no proof . . . that they are the Unique Being. The very writings of their different teachers and the myths peculiar to all the false sects prove that sufficiently . . . [18]

Nobili ventures into etymological proof for this severe rejection of the *Trimūrti*, or more precisely, *Trimūrti* as an adequate translation for Trinity. But he may intrigue the modern student of Indian thought much more by his reference to a proof of his point from the testimony of Sanskrit authors:

> Many Sanskrit authors themselves declare that the Trimūrti of Brahma, Vishnu and Rudra is not God, but the three qualities (which follow): Clemency (Sativigam), Impassibility (Thamasan) and Passion (Rasadham). The Mayavadis believe the same thing. All this cannot belong to the Absolute God and thus this doctrine is completely erroneous. Moreover Śâṅkara and his disciples teach that the word Trimūrti signifies utility: which proves with evidence that this Trimūrti cannot be the Absolute One . . . If, moreover, we study attentively the different sects of this country in conflict among themselves, we learn from authors like Barthuruhari that Absolute Blessedness cannot be achieved by Brahma, Vishnu and Rudra, and that the worshippers of these gods are in error.

---

[17] *Hinduism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1966), p. 86.

[18] Rocaries, p. 171.

Some Sanskrit authors teach . . . that the three—Brahma, Vishnu and Rudra themselves— are incapable of knowing the true God. Their teaching itself proves that these Trimūrtigal are not God.[19]

Nobili's calling on the authority of Sanskrit authors is a revealing aspect of the specifically Catholic direction of his thought. He is not bound to biblical sources for his proofs any more than was Thomas Aquinas. The Sanskrit authors take on for Nobili, at least in this passage, some of the authority Thomas ascribed to "the Philosopher," Aristotle. Nobili was apparently not as well disposed to Śankara and other Vedāntic thinkers as this text might hint, but he seems to have caught the great Advaitin's teaching on the nirguna Brahman (Absolute Reality considered without qualities) which cannot be reduced to any of its manifestations.[20] Nobili finds in this central Advaitin doctrine fuel for his own "natural theology."

This Catholic tendency to approach God not only by faith but by philosophy as well brought Nobili to an appreciation of the speculative genius of Śaṅkara. Although Nobili was at first hopeful of having found an Indian Aristotle in Śaṅkara, whose philosophy might be transformed as the framework of an Indian Christian theology, he eventually came to the conclusion that Vedāntic thought was irretrievably monist. It left no room for a theological explanation of union with God or salvation which leaves human liberty intact.[21] In his search for an alternative philosophical system within the Indian tradition, Nobili fastened onto the less exciting but highly analytic Nyōya thought.[22] It appealed to his Tridentine and Jesuit predisposition to controversialism and scholasticism. Not enough of his writings on Nyāya thinkers are available in our sources for any further examination of how well he understood their speculation.

Conclusion

The Tridentine-Baroque Catholic optimism with regard to human nature, Catholic anti-iconoclastic sacramentalism and traditionalist rather than biblicist orientations have all been cited as the background for Nobili's unique ability to sympathize with and under-

[19] Rocaries, p. 172.

[20] Cf. M. Hiriyanna, *Outlines of Indian Philosophy* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1932), pp. 373ff.

[21] Cf. Cronin, p. 94.

[22] Cf. Cronin, pp. 171–72.

stand Indian religiousness. His Jesuit ascetical formation may make more understandable his personal capacity to forsake the life-style of a European Jesuit and adopt that of a Christian *sannyāsī*. In the few translations available of his Tamil writings and his Italian and Latin letters back to Europe we can see something of his grasp on the social structure and religious thought of his section of seventeenth century India.

But Nobili is dead, the India of the seventeenth century has changed radically, and modern Catholicism considers itself post-Tridentine, post-baroque. It is hard at first sight to think of any abiding values in the career of Nobili which might be relevant today in the encounter of the world's religious traditions, and more particularly, the mutual understanding and encounter of Catholic Christianity and the Indian religious tradition. His rejection of Vedāntic thought strikes us today as singularly shortsighted and his championing of caste status quite out of date.

Perhaps the only continuing value to any aspect of Nobili's career for today's situation is his Catholic confidence in the ability of all men to come to the knowledge of God. For a Catholic it is absolutely impossible to be orthodox and to say that "Without the particular knowledge of God in Jesus Christ, men do not really know God at all." This formulation of Christian theology, discussed a few years back by the United Church of Canada's commission on faith, has provoked some of the most incisive writing of Wilfred Cantwell Smith.[23] Much of the clear Catholic rejection of this sort of exclusivistic thinking has come about since the middle of the nineteenth century as a reaction against various Catholic varieties of Kantian pessimism about human knowledge of God. Just as the Council of Trent refused to accept Lutheran pessimism about the effects of sin on human nature, the First Vatican Council (1869-1870) refused to accept the fideistic denial of any knowledge of God by the light of human reason alone.

The Tridentine rejection of Lutheran pessimism about human nature untouched by the saving word of Jesus Christ met its first concrete examples of man at least visibly untouched by the Christian kerygma in the Catholic missionary expansion of the baroque age.

[23] Cf. *The Faith of Other Men* (New York: New American Library, 1965), pp. 119ff.

Starting as they did with Tridentine optimism, it is not too surprising, then, that, for all their polemics with the Indian and Chinese thinkers, these early Jesuit missionaries found much to be admired in the religiousness of these Indians and Chinese. The consummate ability of these non-Christian peoples to discuss lofty theological questions about God impressed these Jesuits deeply. This Catholic optimism about man's natural knowledge of God, as finally formulated at Vatican I, is often a source of embarrassment in Christian ecumenical dialogue. But I would venture to suggest that this Catholic tradition that "God . . . can be known with certainty by the natural light of human reason"[24] is the best possible beginning for the greater ecumenism which lies ahead of us as a planet of religious peoples.

[24] DS 3004.

THE SUPERIOR'S ROLE WITHIN OBEDIENCE

the view of Ignatius

Mark R. Voss, S.J.

I) The Ignatian Aim

Service, rather than a mystical union or transformation, was the result of the spiritual dynamism through which Ignatius of Loyola was led. All of the various aspects of this Ignatian spirituality, prayer, abnegation, finding God in all things, even the enthusiastic attachment for Christ himself, were geared to performing this service of God; every deliberation and decision of Ignatius was done in the light of this overwhelming desire to serve God.

Christ sacrificed himself because of his love for men, for their redemption. He was the pre-eminent servant, and thus Ignatius is drawn to give a tender and unwearied effort for the souls Christ loved and redeemed. He always did the will of his Father in his role as servant, and so Ignatius, in his insatiable desire to imitate Christ, centered his own service not upon his own will and his own ideas, but upon the will of the Father and the inspirations of the Spirit. A faithful and dedicated servant does not do his own will, but the will of him whom he serves. As a consequence the dynamic element within the characteristically Ignatian concept of service is that the service can only be that which Christ wants. Herein lies the Ignatian *magis:* the greater honor and glory to God which can be pursued in an action *only* when the will of God is discerned with regard to that action. Prayer and contemplation then are centered upon finding the

will of God in all matters; abnegation and self-sacrifice are meant to produce a man who is selfless and who can, therefore, find the will of God and act upon it, rather than to act for personal interest.[1]

Pursuing this line of thought, then, the Society of Jesus could work for the greater honor and glory of God if and only if it is free enough to do that which may be unconventional, since God's will could conceivably ask for unconventional service; the religious orders existing at the time of the Society's beginnings were tied down to particular works by their Constitutions, and Ignatius wanted his companions to be capable of *magis*. There could be no *a priori* determination of the works of the Society;[2] the Jesuit was to be mobile. He was to find God's will in everything and be willing and able to act upon it. The *Constitutions* of the Society are both a testimony to Ignatius' faith and trust that God will make his will known and a realistic set of guidelines to insure that the Society remain open to God's will and be able to act upon it. The *Constitutions*' statements regarding poverty, obedience, prayer, abnegation, education are all pointed toward Loyola's vision of the Society as a group of men whose rationale was the *magis:* God's will.[3]

II) The Society and God's Will

The discernment of spirits

The Supreme Wisdom and Goodness of God our Creator and Savior are what must preserve, direct, and carry forward in His divine service this

[1] Joseph DeGuibert, S.J., *The Jesuits: Their Spiritual Doctrine and Practice,* translated by William J. Young, S.J., (Chicago: The Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1964). For all the material cited in this and the preceding paragraph, consult the first section of this work. Cf. especially pp. 127, 132, and also 584–5."[The correction of faults, the acquisition of virtues, and prayer itself] are means to put the soul under the full dominion of God's love and thus render it entirely docile to his every wish in order to give service and glory to him, the sole and unique end of everything. Prayer is a means by which the soul can be penetrated with the supernatural spirit, united with its Creator and Lord, and placed completely under the influence of his grace" (571).

[2] For example, to decide to send more than one or two men to a mission "is something the superior will have authority to do, according as the unction of the Holy Spirit inspired or as he judges in his divine majesty to be better and more expedient." *(The Constitutions of the Society of Jesus,* 625; tr. George E. Ganss, S.J., to be published shortly.) This translation hereafter referred to as *Const.*

[3] *Const.,* 134, 547.

least Society of Jesus.[4]

The primary and most basic faith-centered presupposition of Loyola is that the creator and savior would provide the Society with the grace and light needed for it to serve God. *The Constitutions* will "aid us to proceed better . . . along the path of divine service . . .,"[5] but it is the savior who will make his way known.

Nevertheless, a characteristically Ignatian insight is that only a man who has divested himself of self-interest will be able to find and embrace the will of God. Thus a *sine qua non*, a first principle, for service of the master, is abnegation. The discernment of God's will is impossible if there is present a personal concern and an incomplete interest in Christ's will.[6] As with abnegation, so too with prayer and the Spiritual Exercises: they are not ends in themselves; they are means

> . . . which have as their purpose . . . that no decision is made under the influence of any inordinate attachment, [and thereby of] seeking and finding the will of God in the disposition of our life.[7]

The superiors of the society

The general of the Society must be a man with two characteristics: 1) that he be a man possessing the capabilities necessary to determine what might be the will of God and 2) that he be one who will be able to direct the Society in its implementation of God's will.[8] His qualities fall into three categories: 1) his relationship with God, 2) his virtues, and 3) his physical characteristics.[9]

The most important "quality" of the general (and hence of any superior of the Society[10]), is that "he be closely united with God our Lord and intimate with Him in prayer and in all his actions."[11] As a result of this union the superior will more readily receive for the

---

[4] *Const.*, 134.
[5] *Const.*, 134.
[6] DeGuibert, pp. 137 and 595.
[7] *Sp Ex*, 21.
[8] *Const.*, 666.
[9] *Const.*, 724.
[10] *Const.*, 820, and DeGuibert, p. 158. *Const.*, 811 says: "From what has been said about the General it will be possible to infer what is applicable to the provincial superiors, local superiors, and rectors of colleges, with respect to their qualifications."
[11] *Const.*, 723.

Society those gifts and graces which will direct the Society and also receive for the Society the power to effectively carry out this direction.[12] Secondly, the superior is to be a man whose virtues are those which will permit him to objectively determine the will of God in all things and also serve as an example to the men under him: humility and charity, without which the Society could not function;[13] independent of all passions "so that in his interior they may not disturb the judgment of his intellect" and that in his exterior he may serve as an example to those who observe him;[14] rectitude mixed with kindness and gentleness that "he neither allows himself to swerve from what he judges to be more pleasing to God our Lord," and that his men can recognize "that in what he does he is proceeding rightly in our Lord . . .";[15] and in addition a great magnanimity and fortitude so that he might be able to initiate and persevere in "great undertakings" which reason and the divine service require.[16]

In other words he is a man sensitive to the light of the Spirit and strong enough to carry it through as well as possess those characteristics which will inspire trust in his judgment.

The third quality is that he ought to be endowed with great understanding and judgment, in order that this talent may not fail him either in the speculative or the practical matters which may arise.[17]

We also have

. . . experience in spiritual and interior matters, that he may be able to discern the various spirits and to give counsel and remedies to so many who will have spiritual necessities.[18]

In summary then, these first three, and most important, qualities are intended by Ignatius to show that the superior is to be a man whose primary task is to discern the will of the creator and savior and to inspire his own men to understanding and action.[19]

---

[12] *Const.*, 723.
[13] *Const.*, 725.
[14] *Const.*, 726.
[15] *Const.*, 727.
[16] *Const.*, 728.
[17] *Const.*, 729.
[18] *Const.*, 729.
[19] *Const.*, 767, 789, and 790. Note also what Ignatius has to say in 797 about lower superiors. Note also 423:

"An effort should be made that the rector should be a man of great ex-

Christ in the superior

. . . we should be ready to receive [the superior's] command just as if it were coming from Christ our Savior, since we are fulfilling the command in His place and because of love and reverence for Him.[20]

Ignatius can say that a subject should obey "just as if it were coming from Christ" because in the *human-sin-laden* situation the best we can do is to let the superior have the ultimate decision because he is ideally among the most open to the will of God and therefore more likely to see clearly what the will of God is in a given situation. Ignatius presupposes that we have picked one from among the singularly most selfless individuals, and that God's love will be active most effectively in him because of his selflessness. Therefore

. . . [the subject] ought to hold it as certain that by this procedure he is conforming himself with the divine will more than by those he could do while following his own will and judging differently.[21]

The superior, thus, is "the one who holds the place of Christ our Lord" for the subject because in so doing the subject is assured that in his human situation he has taken the best possible means available to arrive at the will of God.[22] This key idea stems from Ignatius' keen sense of realism.

I think we are now in a better position to comprehend the profound nature of obedience-of-the-understanding. The understanding of the superior is ideally that which is most likely in conformity with the will of Christ; his understanding of a particular matter is what it is because of his intimacy with God our Lord, and his selflessness—his lack of personal interest. Therefore, ideally, when the subject's

---

ample, edification, and mortification of all his evil inclinations, and one especially approved in regard to his obedience and humility. He ought likewise to be discreet, fit for governing, experienced in both matters of business and of the spiritual life. He should know how to mingle severity with kindness at the proper times. He should be alert, stalwart under work, a man of learning, and finally, one in whom the higher superiors can confide and to whom they can with security delegate their authority. For the more all this will be verified, the better can the colleges be governed for the greater glory of God."

[20] *Const.*, 547.

[21] *Const.*, 547.

[22] The problem of the poor command will be treated below.

understanding is in conformity with that of the superior, it would be so because the subject's understanding stems from the same graces and same type of selflessness. The subject thus will himself grow in his intimacy with Christ.

The superior is also human

St. Ignatius was a realist, and he knew that, in spite of his legislation, there would be superiors and subjects who would not live up to the ideals he sketched in his *Constitutions.* He knew it would be seldom that his ideals would be attained and his sense of realism dictated that he include within his legislation checks upon and aids for his superiors. This definitely fits in with the Ignatian ideal to do as much as humanly possible to insure that the will of God would be recognized and executed; he saw that the Society could do nothing without God's assistance, yet he was also wary lest the Society slip into an attitude of overconfidence. His checks and aids for superiors were intended to assure that the Society of Jesus did as much as humanly possible to insure its following the ideal of the *magis.*

1) *Consultors.* As we generally have them now: four assistants of discretion and goodness who can aid the superior in matters pertaining to his office and with whom he should discuss the matters of importance.[23]

2) *Syndics (correctors or informants).* These men were to report at least weekly to the rector on all matters of his concern: classes, individual teachers, etc. They were to keep the rector totally informed of all trouble areas and those matters where the rector may have erred And if asked to do so, they were to admonish, advise, or correct individual Jesuits.[24] Their primary task, however, was to keep the rector completely informed.

3) *Collateral.* If a superior of a province or house should be lacking experience or any other necessary qualities which a superior should have, a higher superior may assign to him a collateral whose attributes would complement those of the lower superior. This collateral would not be subject to the lower superior, but would live with the superior, and have two functions. First, he was to express

[23] *Const.,* 431 and 490.

[24] *Const.,* 371, 504, and 770.

his opinion to the superior in any difficult matters and guide him in his decisions. If the superior should appear to err in particular decisions, the collateral should inform both the higher and the lower superior. The advice of the collateral could be about any matter pertaining to the superior's office or person. Secondly, he is to function as a liaison between the superior and his subjects, trying to move among the subjects effecting their understanding of the superior and his decisions and their having the proper esteem and love toward their superior. He is also to exert his influence toward creating an atmosphere of accord and agreement among the subjects.[25]

In summary, the collateral was to be a man who was to aid a given superior in the functions of his office and was to help preserve the community's union which Ignatius valued so highly.[26] And he was to serve as a check upon the superior since his qualities were to be complementary; he was to keep the higher superiors informed about the lower superior, and was to listen to and weigh the opinions of the men of the community, and convey them to the superior.

4) *Reports to Higher Superiors.*

When the superior general or the provincial desires more complete information, not only should the collateral, syndic, and board of consultants write about the rector and all the others, but each of the teachers and approved scholastics as well as of formed coadjutors should write his opinion about all of them, the rector included. That this may not seem to be something new, this report should be written as something ordinary at least every three years.[27]

This is definitely another practical means to insure that the government of the house was being conducted according to the ideals Ignatius laid down.

5) *The Search for Advice.* Essential for determining the will of God is as complete a knowledge and understanding as is possible in a given situation,[28] and in complex situations Ignatius wanted to be assured that advice and counsel would be sought before the deci-

[25] *Const.*, 490, 659–662.

[26] In the *Constitutions,* the collateral is discussed within the context of "means to preserve the union of the Society."

[27] *Const.*, 507.

[28] *Sp Ex*, 280–82.

sions were made. Throughout the *Constitutions,* we see Ignatius telling his superiors to seek such counsel. The general must consult the provincials when considering a decision which will affect them although the final decision remains his;[29] must consult the general congregation before abandoning a college,[30] and must consult with those who have a better understanding of the matter of accepting colleges under unusual conditions. Superiors must get advice before sending individuals to the missions;[31] before dismissing anyone, the provincial must listen to those who know the individual and whose opinions would be relevant;[32] and the rector of a college must summon representatives of the faculty as well as the other officials of the college before taking actions on the faculty of a department of a college. In fact, "if it seems wise to the rector, he may also summon others from within and without the Society to the meeting in order that by learning the opinions of all he may the better decide upon what is expedient."[33]

Summary and conclusions

The superior was to be one who could discern as clearly as possible what the will of God was in each decision-situation. Yet it seems clear from the foregoing section that Ignatius did not think that this ability would come automatically by virtue of the superior's office; Ignatius knew there would be graces consequent upon being a superior, but also legislated to make certain that the superior did all that was humanly possible to be completely informed and thus more open to the will of God. Yes, the will of the superior would be the will of Christ, at least, when considering the whole complexus of decisions; this seemed to be the best manner available to us as men to determining Christ's will, and Ignatius wanted to be certain that as much as possible was done to insure the proper discernment of God's will.

---

[29] *Const.,* 761, 791.

[30] *Const.,* 322.

[31] *Const.,* 618.

[32] *Const.,* 221.

[33] *Const.,* 502.

III) Obedience and Community

The institute of the Society of Jesus was directly organized to help and dispose souls to gain their ultimate end through the manner which God indicates.[34] The *chief means* to this service of God is the union of the members. The corporate entity, the Society of Jesus, is to be the means whereby God is served; and the individual Jesuit is to find within this union the means whereby he, as an individual, was to receive the help he would need to serve God.[35]

With regard to the Society as a whole, as a corporate entity, the chief means to this union is obedience[36], which will link all members together to insure a common purpose. As a result of obedience, the Society can function as one body, and therefore be more effective in the service of Christ.[37]

Also, each individual Jesuit's goal is to do the will of God. His love for God and his desire to serve him is the reason he has incorporated himself within the Society. On the whole, and as discussed previously, the superior should be the one who has the qualities which enable him to most accurately discern the will of God. Therefore, the Superior's role is to aid each individual in search for God's will. If we assume that the individual Jesuit is a Jesuit because of his desire to serve God within such a group of men, and we assume that the Superior is making use of all of the spiritual and human means possible to insure that he is able to discern the graces being given to his community[38], then we can see that it will be primarily the superior who will bring his community together in a union of wills.[39] His role is to serve the community by helping each individual find the will of God for him within the larger context of the community, the Society, and Church.

If the superior is to determine the direction of the workings of the Spirit, it would be incumbent that he understand well the directions that same Spirit is taking within each individual Jesuit. Hence

---

[34] *Const.*, 135 and 156.

[35] *Const.*, *passim*, but especially 624.

[36] *Const.*, 659, 662, and 821.

[37] *Const.*, 821.

[38] Ignatius warns that superiors must be given the time to do this; they must not be burdened down with administrative details.

[39] Ignatius hints at this in *Const.*, 671.

Ignatius incorporates the manifestation of conscience, the explicit purpose of which is a union of wills[40], and also the expression of contrary opinions to the superior.

IV) Conclusions

"Traditional" conceptions

The conception of obedience which many Jesuits have today was formed by Ignatius' famous "Letter on Obedience" to the Society in Portugal in 1553. This is unfortunate because extreme circumstances motivated this letter.

> The letter was occasioned by those members of the Province of Portugal who were very attached to Father Simon Rodrigues, excessively so, with an affection that was too natural and unspiritual. Rodrigues' method of government had erred on the side of mildness and softness, with the result that, when he was removed, these *subjects refused obedience* to any other superior than himself or one appointed by him.[41]

This points up the problem of absolutizing a letter. Because the circumstances in Portugal constituted a grave threat to the very existence of the Society, it was incumbent upon Ignatius to "lay down the law." His letter would have to emphasize the necessity for *obeying* to the exclusion of other essential factors in the total context of obedience. Ignatius would not have wanted this letter to be the document which formed the complete Jesuit ideal of obedience, since very little is said in it about the role of the superior, which of course constitutes a rather essential part of Ignatian obedience. Nevertheless this letter, and even some of its most extreme parts has, *de facto*, formed the concept of obedience for many Jesuits.

When one takes "The Letter" as the criterion for his study of Ignatian obedience, one can arrive at the conclusion that Ignatius and faith teach

> . . . that the command of the Superior is not in reality the command of a man, but the command of God himself, who avails Himself of man as a conscious instrument for the transmission of his will.[42]

---

[40] *Const.*, 424.

[41] *Letters of St. Ignatius of Loyola* (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1959), tr. Wm. J. Young, S.J., p. 287. Italics added.

[42] Espinosa Polit, S.J., *Perfect Obedience* (Westminster: Newman, 1947), p. 287.

The inspiration becomes almost completely vertical: God to superior. In fact, Polit (whose classic treatment of obedience adorns many shelves in Jesuit houses) carries this vertical descent to the extent of saying:

> In the same way [as in the Eucharist], Christ conceals Himself from us in our Superior. In spite of his imperfection, [the Superior] is for us the representative of Christ; Christ hides beneath the weakness and imperfections of the man, just as he conceals Himself beneath the sacramental species.[43]

This type of exposé is unIgnatian in that it obliterates the horizontal aspect of obedience. Loyola was extremely conscious of the fact that the Spirit would move in all his men, and that the Superior would have to depend very much upon his men for "light." To insure this, Ignatian realism demanded this horizontal aspect be juridically established within the *Constitutions:*[44] syndics; consultors; collaterals; letters every third year, if not more often; constant advice—all of those because of a realization that a superior is human.

Implications of Ignatian obedience

Ignatian obedience is indeed a testimony to divine providence; it is a sign of the fact that a man believes that God is an active force in his life, that God's grace is present in what is commonly known as the apostolate. We should not merely think in terms of individual commands; the vow of obedience constitutes a permanent life—form giving man a God-ward orientation within the framework of the Church. As with the vows of poverty and chastity, obedience too is a sign; a sign of God's active presence within the world.

But a truly Ignatian obedience is also a sign of the fact that we cannot sit back and let God move us. Ignatius was extremely

---

[43] Polit, p. 62. I would not like to be asked to explain such a statement, especially in the light of all the aids and helps Ignatius thought it necessary to give the Superior. Yet this conception of obedience is alive today among Jesuits, and that fact must be recognized.

[44] The Society as a whole might very well consider whether such a juridical legislation might not be a much more realistic thing than the recommendations along this line as spelled out by the 31st General Congregation. Realism would seem to demand, as experience has taught, that for the protection of the Society's individuals and unity, such light - seeking aids and juridical checks be firmly reestablished within the practices of the Society.

conscious of the fact that a juridically established superior would not, by that very fact alone, have a corner on the market of God's grace. Ignatian obedience is also a sign to men that, although we do trust in the presence of God's help, we also must be an active, imaginative, initiating, charismatic force within his economy of salvation. The *magis* of Ignatius is that we do what is God's will, and this implies that we be open to possibilities which may not lie within our currently operative conceptual schemes. For Ignatius, this applies to both superior and subject. The spirit of Ignatius is that the superior *should* use (not "could use") any and all possible means to discern the spirits, as his subjects must also do if they are sons of Ignatius.

The problem of the bad command

The service of God demanded that the unity of the Society be preserved. Loyola saw that, as in all human societies, if obedience is left to the discretion of the individual, the corporate nature of the Society was in peril; this is a sociological fact. Nevertheless, Ignatius also saw that poor superiors would probably spring up, and so he took steps to minimize this possibility. Superiors come from among our best men; they are given collaterals, syndics, and consultors; they are to seek advice; and subjects report on all of these men regularly. If poor commands [45] still do result, the Jesuit is to obey; the greater good demands the unity of the Society. The Jesuit is a man who is living his life because of his desire for the greater service of God; in a given undesirable situation he must realize that the overall good demands that he be obedient.

Karl Rahner develops this idea.[46] Dedication in obedience is a choice of an unforeseeable destiny; a gamble found in every state of life. Without such a dedication or surrender to the unknown future, a man would be caught in his own egoistic anxiety—a sure way to

---

[45] We shall assume throughout this section that the command does not speak about *sin*. This is a greater problem than we think. As "protest" grows, there will be more Jesuits who will feel in conscience that they must protest, for example. If a superior commands them not to, this could conceivably involve a matter of sin. This problem needs much work, as do many other conflicts of conscience of a similar type.

[46] Karl Rahner, S.J., "Reflections on Obedience: A Basic Ignatian Concept," *Cross Currents* 10 (1960), 369–70.

destruction. "But the man who gives himself to what is higher and nobler, who takes the gamble, knows that he is doing what Christ did in his obedience."[47] Christ lived to do what he knew he had to do, even though it led to death on the cross. The Father willed that Christ, as a man, proclaim the Kingdom, and part of being a man was that he should suffer for this.

The religious dedicates his life in a sign that God's will is active in this world. An essential part of this dedication is that it be in the world of real men, and as such there shall be stupidities and bad will. These stupidities are the will of God in a permissive sense; he wants us to live a life of dedication in this real and occasionally stupid world. With Christ, the cross was a must. So too in religious obedience; after all possible attempts have been made to change a bad command, such a command becomes the practical occasion for the embodiment of that faith in God's grace.

Ignatius also saw that a life dedicated to service would require a great deal of selflessness and thus if a bad command is given, obedience could also be conceived of as a means by which to grow in selflessness, a means to reduce pride, which will result in greater indifference, so important for a man dedicated to doing God's will and not his own. (This is considerably more positive than "self-immolation" which is occasionally held up as a reason for one's acquiescence in obedience; it is hard to see how subjection to the will of another for its own sake could be considered anything more than amoral.)

This leaves untouched the problem of the habitually obtuse superior.[48] It seems to the writer that if superiors are picked more for their spiritual sensitivity than for their organizational ability, and are given the checks and aids which Ignatius thought so important, (1) this problem would arise much less frequently, and (2) when it did, the situation would come to the surface much more quickly and could thus more easily be corrected.

---

[47] Rahner, pp. 373–74.

[48] A situation of this sort would seem to me to be a contradiction of the entire purpose of obedience, and if the means which the *Constitutions* insist upon are not being employed to ward off or correct such situations, one might legitimately ask if one is bound by the vow of obedience. After all, the religious life receives the approbation of the Church because of the Constitutions of the given religious order or congregation.

Obedience today

We find in the Church today a keener awareness of the historical dimensions of man's search for God, and God's continuing self-revelation, jarring with the still dominant mentality of a relatively static and essentialistic and deductive understanding of God's relation to man. These two attitudes find their way into religious orders also. The traditional mentality emphasizes corporate endeavors, a hierarchical authority structure, and individual self-effacement, and the commands of God are seen to be a *sure* way to find the will of God. On the other hand, we find a much more personalistic approach which places emphasis on individual responsibility, shared participation in making decisions, and a concern for the uniqueness of individual members. As a consequence the special charismatic qualities of the authority-obedience process are brought into question.

Non-essentialistic, too, is Ignatius when writing about the Society. His presupposition was that he could not be *a priori* about the means which the Society was to use in the service of Christ. There is nothing static about the Society as Ignatius conceived of it; it had to be mobile, completely mobile.

1) *Corporate endeavors* were seen by Ignatius to be generally the more effective means to service, but he certainly foresaw that occasions would arise when it would be more effective to have one man go off on his own, or that individuals would work independently of one another; it was, as always, a matter of the *magis*.[49]

2) *A hierarchical authority structure* was incorporated into the Society, some form of which would seem to have to be present in any corporate endeavor, as the deliberations of the early Fathers of the Society saw.[50] But the Ignatian authority was not God to general to provincial to rector to superior in a vertical pipeline arrangement; it also included a horizontal dimension which employed almost every conceivable human means.

3) *Individual responsibility* was the entire rationale of the Spir-

[49] *Const.*, 624.

[50] The early Fathers of the Society, after they had taken their vow to go to Jerusalem, and after that vow had fallen through, decided that the greater service of God demanded that they corporately serve the Church. They also decided that such a corporate commitment demanded that they give themselves in obedience to one of their number.

itual Exercises: that the individual might be able to discern the will of God in all matters. In any case, Ignatius would certainly want every Jesuit to be constantly on the alert for the *magis*. This would seem to be a rather deep form of individual responsibility.

4) All Jesuits were to *share in the making of decisions*, at least to the extent that they were to keep the superior informed of everything, and to which the superior, always looking for the greater service of God rather than his own egoistic desires, was to be completely open. Even democratic processes were not out of the picture, as Ignatius' orders to the community at Gandia indicate: the community was told to elect their superior since higher superiors felt the community could determine this issue more effectively.[51]

5) The spirit of Ignatius would rejoice at an *increased awareness of the uniqueness of individuals* within the Society since he was so conscious of the necessity to use every possible means in the service of God, and so wary lest the superiors of the Society become narrow minded in their approach to the apostolate. He would assume, again, that all concerned were to serve God's will rather than their own, and would have been happy to see unique approaches developing because of unique individuals.

6) If Loyola saw any *special charismatic qualities* in the authority-obedience process, it was certainly in a modified sort of charism. He saw that there would be bad commands and poor superiors, but he structured into the Society means to make sure that the individual charism of the superior was not his own charism and was open to the charism of the Spirit. Even with regard to the pope himself, Ignatius was in no way prepared to bow to him with respect to his every wish. Ignatius makes it very clear that this fourth vow of the professed was with respect to the *places* to which the Society might be sent.[52] Nor was he ready to have his men respect the Pope's desires with respect to special dignities, and expecially so with regard to the general. The general could not accept an

---

[51] *Letters of St. Ignatius of Loyola*, pp. 140ff.

[52] In a footnote to the actual formula of the fourth vow, #527, Ignatius says: "The entire meaning of this fourth vow of obedience to the Pope was and is with regard to the missions." It seems clear then that although we may be an Order dedicated to the Pope, still we do not owe obedience to the Pope in every matter because of the vow.

ecclesiastical dignity without the approval of the entire Society, and the entire Society was forbidden by the *Constitutions* to give this approval unless the Pontiff compels the approval "by a precept obliging under sin."[53] In short, Ignatius was acutely aware of the human weaknesses and shortcomings in every human being, and any charisms superiors would have would not necessarily shine through their shortcomings.

7) A flexible, creative way of meeting the changing apostolic needs of the Kingdom was the rationale of the Society; God's will would not be rigid and unchanging, and Ignatius only wanted that the Society would be able to continue to meet such divine desires.

The Society of Jesus was founded because the Church needed a religious order which would be mobile; juridically the Society is mobile—at least as it exists on the pages of the *Constitutions*. Sociologically speaking, because of the temper of current thought, a religious order must be mobile. I submit Ignatius was a man of our times.

[53] *Const.*, 771, 772, 786, and 788.

SIMON FOUCHE, S.J.

missionary, educator, spiritual director

Sr. M. Lilliana Owens, S.L.

Simon Fouché, Kentucky frontier missionary, educator and spiritual director, was born in Paris, France, on May 9, 1789. He lost his parents at an early age, and Msgr. E. Maignan, his uncle, a Catholic priest, assumed responsibility for young Fouché. The French Revolution had just begun, Msgr. Maignan knew the danger of it all, but he decided to remain at his post in Paris, serving the people for whom he had been ordained priest. He knew full well, were his identity discovered, he would be put to death. However, he managed to keep himself concealed. He worked zealously for souls, but being a prudent man, and in order to be less liable to discovery by the officials, he changed his name, adopted a trade, took his sister as his housekeeper, and introduced and registered her as his wife. They took with them Simon Fouché, then four or five years of age, who was designated by them as their child.[1]

Fr. Simon Fouché's memories of the French Revolution were always very vivid. He loved to recall the civic dinners spread in the streets of the city, of which everyone had to partake. He took great

[1] Jardinis to Owens, S.L., September 24, 1966. Rev. Pauladis Jardinis, S.J. is stationed at College de Sainte-Marie, Montreal (2) Canada. His letter, dated September 24, 1966, contains material he gathered from archival sources at this college. The author, a member of the Congregation of the Sisters of Loretto, contacted the archivist at the College of Sainte Marie, Montreal, and received this information as a reply.

pride in telling that his supposed father, Père Maignan, belonged to the National Guard, and often had to go on duty dressed in military attire with musket. In spite of the grave dangers, and his military duties, Père Maignan said Mass, heard confessions, and administered the sacraments to many, who remained good Christians, in the midst of the most terrifying scenes.[2]

On one occasion he recalled how Père Maignan had given the last sacraments to Marie Antoinette the night before her execution.[3] In fact due to the careful management of his supposed wife, in reality, as stated before, his sister, he obtained permission from the housekeeper of the Conciergerie, where the queen, Marie Antoinette, was imprisoned, to enter her cell at night. Père Maignan was not satisfied with bringing the condemned queen the Holy Eucharist, which he carefully concealed on his person, but persuaded two municipal officers charged with her care, to conduct him at midnight to her cell. Here he read Mass for her and the guards charged with her custody profited by the occasion to confess their sins and to receive Holy Communion.[4]

After his classical and theological studies young Fouché was named teacher in the institution founded by Abbé Liotart, which later became Le Collége Stanislaus still existing in Paris.[5] He was ordained to the priesthood in 1816, and remained in the same college as spiritual director, or counsellor to the students.

In 1821 Abbé Liotart went to New Orleans, Louisiana, in the United States and opened a college. Fr. Fouché accompanied him and became a member of the faculty of this new college. Later, when the New Orleans College was destroyed by fire, Fr. Fouché, then a diocesan priest, went to the new college organized by Bishop Benedict Joseph Flaget in Bardstown, Kentucky. According to B. J. Webb, this must have been about 1822 or 1824. This same author gives his memories of Fouché as follows:

---

[2] B. J. Webb, *Catholicity in Kentucky* (Louisville: Rogers, 1884), p. 287. Cf. also Anna Blanche Mc Gill, S.C.N., *The Sisters of Charity of Nazareth,* (New York: The Encyclopedia Press, 1917), pp. 34–35.

[3] Webb, p. 390.

[4] Père Maignan died Curé de St. Germaine l'Auxerreis at Paris. Cf. Webb, p. 39; also WOODSTOCK LETTERS 19 (1890) 124.

[5] Jardinis to Owens, S.L., Sept. 24, 1966.

It must have been after 1822 and before 1825 that they (Father Simon Fouché and Evremond Harrisart) appeared together as officials of . . . the college. I know they were both attached to the Cathedral of St. Joseph, serving at its altars, etc. They were both men of learning and piety, and both exemplified in their manner of life the sacerdotal virtues that became them as administrators of divine things. . . . they walked the seminary lawn and recited the canonical office together, and *together* they were associated in the minds of all, who had the happiness of knowing them. They were nothing, however, alike in their personal appearance. . . . Father Fouché was diminutive in stature. He was vivacious in both action and speech, and he was altogether what is understood by the term *companionable.*[6]

Bardstown

The ecclesiastical difficulties in New Orleans at this time were also an added reason why several of the young clergymen sought admission into the Bardstown Diocese and other dioceses of the U.S.A.[7] In the summer of 1823 Fr. Fouché was incardinated into the Diocese of Bardstown. Fouché knew very little English, so during the latter part of 1823,[8] Bishop Benedict Joseph Flaget named him chaplain to the Sisters of Charity of Nazareth, Kentucky, in order that he might have the opportunity, while there, of perfecting his knowledge of the English language.[9] Anna Blanche Mc Gill says:

During the latter part of 1823, Nazareth enjoyed having as one of its first chaplains, the Reverend Simon Fouché, who had lately arrived from France. This priest was the nephew and ward of Père E. Maignan, who under the most dangerous circumstances had been confessor to Marie Antoinette, during her imprisonment.[10]

While he was learning the English language he taught the frontier children Christian doctrine, and it seems almost certain that he en-

---

[6] Webb, p. 391.

[7] David to Bruté, Mar. 21, 1825, CAUA, N.D. John B. David was the coadjutor to Benedict Joseph Flaget, the first Bishop of the Diocese of Bardstown, Kentucky. Simon Bruté de Remur was first a member of the Sulpician Society, and on May 6, 1834, when Pope Gregory XVI created the diocese of Vincennes (Indiana), he was named its first Bishop.

[8] J. Herman Schauinger, *Cathedrals in the Wilderness,* (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1952), p. 221.

[9] Mc Gill, pp. 34–35. Srs. Ellen and Harriet, S.C.N., were his instructors.

[10] Mc Gill, pp. 34–35.

couraged the study of French.[11]

In the spring of 1820 Rev. Charles Nerinckx, one of the most zealous frontier missionaries of the time, and the founder of the Sisters of Loretto at the Foot of the Cross, went to Belgium soliciting funds for the Kentucky missions and recruits for the Society of Jesus. Before leaving for this European trip he purchased, with the money loaned him by the Sisters of Loretto, a plot of land from a certain Mr. James Ray.[12] He named the new site Mt. Mary,[13] and his plan was to establish here a vocational institute for the education of boys. Fr. Charles Nerinckx left for Europe in March, 1820. Rev. William Byrne was named to replace him as pastor at St. Charles and to act as the confessor of the Sisters of Loretto at the

---

[11] Cf. U.S.A. (Loretto) Documents, 1808–1850, in Propaganda Fide Archives, Rome Italy. Also in microfilm at CAUA, N.D., Archives of the Archdiocese of St. Louis, St. Louis, Missouri, and in the Archives of the Loretto Motherhouse, Nerinx, Ky. The documents in the Propaganda Fide Archives carry folio numbers and volume numbers; in this they differ from the methods used in the U.S. Cf. Finbar Kenneally, O.F.M., *United States Documents in the Propaganda Fide Archives.* First Series, vol. 1, pp. 947, 959, 964, for folio numbers to Simon Fouché, S.J. (The Academy of American Franciscan History, Box 5850, Washington, D.C., 20014.)

[12] Rev. Charles Nerinckx, a diocesan priest, was born on October 2, 1761 in Brabant. He was ordained November 4, 1785, by Cardinal de Frankenburg, Archbishop of Mechlin. In 1797 the armies of the French Revolution reached Belgium. Priests were required to take the oath of allegiance to the royalty or go to prison. Fr. Nerinckx considered this oath contrary to the divine and moral law and refused to take it. By so doing he became a hunted fugitive. As early as 1800 he had considered volunteering for the missions in the USA. He realized that his possibilities for exercising the priestly functions, for which he was ordained, were now not possible. Right Rev. John Carroll received him with open arms and assigned him, eventually, to assist Rev. Theodore Badin on the Kentucky frontier, where he became known as one of the foremost missionaries in Kentucky. He soon saw the need for an order of religious women, who would dedicate themselves to the cause of educating the children on the Kentucky frontier. On April 25, 1812 he founded the first community of religious women, without European affiliation, and gave them the name "Friends of Mary under the Cross of Jesus." Today this community is known as the Sisters of Loretto at the Foot of the Cross. Cf. Camillus P. Maes, *The Life of Reverend Charles Nerinckx,* W. J. Howlett, *The Life of Reverend Charles Nerinckx,* and Anna C. Minogue, *Loretto: Annals of a Century* for further information about Fr. Charles Nerinckx and the Sisters of Loretto at the Foot of the Cross.

[13] Walter Hill, S.J., "Reminiscences of St. Mary's College, Kentucky," WOODSTOCK LETTERS, 20 (1891) 29–30, 33.

Foot of the Cross.[14] Fr. Byrne had always been interested in education. He noted that the Sisters of Loretto had a flourishing school for girls, but that there was no provision made for the education of the boys. He relayed his ideas for a school for boys to Bishop Flaget, suggesting that the property about a mile from the convent of the Sisters of Loretto be used for this purpose.[15] Bishop Flaget, forgetting that this land was in the joint ownership of Fr. Charles Nerinckx and the Sisters of Loretto, gave Fr. Byrne permission to open the school. He immediately took possession of Mt. Mary and began to take steps to organize the school for boys. When Fr. Nerinckx returned from Europe on December 21, 1821, he found Mt. Mary had, with the permission of Bishop Flaget, become known as St. Mary's Seminary. It had been Fr. Nerinckx's plan to see the property at Mt. Mary become the home of a brotherhood, which he hoped to found, which would later conduct the vocational institution he envisioned. Fr. Nerinckx knew that to open a school before there were teachers prepared to conduct and manage it would be to court ruin for the fine apostolic work. Soon this became evident. Fr. Byrne's zeal and industry were sadly hampered by a lack of teachers. He had come to the Kentucky frontier from a more settled area in the United States of America and was totally unaware of the ignorance and incompetence, at this time, on the Kentucky frontier, due to the lack of educational opportunities.

By August, 1827 Simon Fouché had become fairly conversant with the English language and Fr. Byrne asked that he be assigned to teaching duties at St. Mary's Seminary.[16] At this time he was acting as confessor and spiritual director to the Sisters of Loretto. He was told by the Bishop to assume the new work but to retain the old. The Sisters of Loretto were at this time (1827) living at St. Stephen's farm, renamed Loretto after the Holy House of Loretto. According to Rev. Walter Hill S.J.: "Father Fouché was confessor

---

[14] Camillus P. Maes, *The Life of Reverend Charles Nerinckx* (Cincinnati, 1880), pp. 383, 384, 388, 389, 546.

[15] Cf. WOODSTOCK LETTERS 20 (1891) 26; Maes, pp. 184–185.

[16] David to Bruté, Oct. 9, 1827, CAUA N.D. Cf. *USA (Loretto) Documents, 1808–1850,* Propaganda Fide Archives, Rome, Italy, for statements that Simon Fouché was now a member of the Diocese of Bardstown, Ky.

here [Loretto Motherhouse] until the Jesuit fathers left St. Mary's College [1846]."[17]

St. Joseph's

As early as 1829 Bishop Flaget offered St. Joseph's College at Bardstown, Kentucky to the Society of Jesus in France.[18] However, as time went on either they did not answer him, or as is probable, his letter was lost. Accordingly Bishop Flaget began to make arrangements for St. Joseph's College. Much to the Bishop's embarrassment and surprise, at the beginning of 1831, four French Jesuits arrived in the United States bound for Bardstown, Kentucky. They were Frs. Peter Chazelle, Nicholas Petit, Peter Ladavière and Bro. Corne. They reached New Orleans toward the end of February, 1831. They had come to accept the invitation of Bishop Flaget to staff the St. Joseph's College. When one recalls the method of mailing letters at this time, on the frontier, the delay of this letter is easily understood. When the group reached New Orleans they were given hospitality by Bishop Leo De Neckere, C.M., and they remained with him until the Lent of 1831. In the meantime Fr. Chazelle opened correspondence with Bishop Flaget about the school which he had invited them to come to the U.S.A. to staff. In the first letter he explained the reason for their delay. Bishop Flaget was naturally very perturbed, as this place was no longer open to them. Yet he kindly invited them into his diocese. Fr. Ladavière and Bro. Corne remained in New Orleans. They were the center round which the Society of Jesus established themselves in Louisiana at Grand Couteau. Frs. Chazelle and Petit proceeded to Bardstown to accept the Bishop's invitation. Fr. Petit was a priest who had had many years of experience in the missionary field and because of this he was given charge of St. Charles parish, near the College, a position he held until the French Jesuits left Kentucky in 1846. The two Jesuits rendered such services as they could at St. Joseph's College, adjoining the seminary. Bishop Flaget asked them to join him in a novena to St. Ignatius Loyola to obtain through the saint's intercession a solution to this very perplexing problem. During this novena Rev. William Byrne

[17] Hill, pp. 25–37.

[18] Gilbert J. Garraghan, S.J., *Jesuits in the Middle United States* (New York: America Press. 1938), pp. 166, 255, 294.

had become very much discouraged with St. Mary's Seminary,[19] and he wrote to Bishop Flaget offering to make the seminary over to the French Jesuits. This settled the matter, and at the end of the novena Frs. Chazelle and Petit assumed charge of the seminary. This was the summer of 1831, but there was still a hurdle to be cleared. The Jesuits were of French extraction, and were, therefore, not proficient in the English language. An added difficulty was that they little understood the character of the boys on the Kentucky frontier. Fr. Byrne consented to remain one more year as president. At the end of that year they invited him to remain another year.

The number of Jesuits were few, but they entered upon their duties with great energy, zeal and dedication. Some vocations sprung up as a result, and recruits were added to their number. The first of these was the young diocesan priest, Simon Fouché, who at this time was director of the seminary. The second was Fr. Evremond Harrisart, superior at the seminary. They both made the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius under the direction of Fr. Chazelle in 1830. He used the same inspired Exercises compiled by St. Ignatius three hundred years before. Young Fr. Simon Fouché asked to enter the Society of Jesus. This was on September 11, 1832. He could not manage to leave his post at the College until September, 1833.[20]

The Kentucky mission of the French Province could not boast of a house of probation, so the Jesuits of the Maryland Province invited Fr. Chazelle to send his novices to White Marsh, Maryland. Fr. Evremond Harrisart had no commitments to prevent his entering at once. He began his novitiate at the end of his retreat. In the meantime Very Rev. Fr. John Roothan, S.J., General of the Society of Jesus, decided to open a novitiate on the Kentucky frontier with Fr. Chazelle, S.J., as master of novices. Prior to this decision Fr. Fouché had entered the Society of Jesus and had made one year of his novitiate at Fordham, New York.[21] As soon as the novitiate was established in Kentucky, Frs. Harrisart and Fouché were invited to return to this novitiate. After their period of training was completed the two priests returned to St. Mary's Seminary. Both men were professionally esteemed. Fr. Simon Fouché spent fifteen years as

[19] Hill, p. 28.

[20] "New York and Canada Missions," WOODSTOCK LETTERS 1 (1872) 113.

[21] Jardinis to Owens, Sept. 24, 1966.

professor of philosophy and mathematics at St. Mary's College.[22] He also acted as procurator and spiritual director of the college. It is of interest to quote from a page of the earliest *Catalog of the Society of Jesus in France.* Among other things it states *"Collegium Kentuckeinse ad S. Mariam et convictus" ineunte MDCCCXXXVI* ... P. Simon Fouché, Prof. Math.; praefectus morum . . ."[23]

A revision of rules

Simon Fouché served as spiritual director of the Sisters of Loretto at the Foot of the Cross at their motherhouse from 1840 to 1846, the year the Jesuits of the French Province left Kentucky. This has great significance for the Sisters of Loretto at the Foot of the Cross. Bishop Guy Chabrat, during the administration of Mother Isabella Clarke, S.L., invited Simon Fouché, S.J., to revise the *Rules and Constitutions* of the Sisters of Loretto.[24] The decision to change the Rules was made by Bishop Chabrat, without consultation with Fr. John Timon, C.M., who had been placed in charge of the Sisters of Loretto in Missouri by Bishop Joseph Rosati, C.M. Since the Sisters of Loretto were not a Pontifical Society at this time Bishop Guy Chabrat was not at liberty to take such a step without consulting either Fr. Timon, C.M., or Bishop Rosati, C.M. Fr. Timon wrote to Bishop Chabrat and asked for an explanation of his action in this regard.[25] Bishop Chabrat replied that it was his intention to review the revised Rules with Father Timon *after the revision had been made.* However, Bishop Flaget, realizing the delicacy of the matter, invited Fr. Timon to come to the Loretto Motherhouse in August, 1840, to visit with him.[26] Timon replied that he would accept this invitation in the later summer of 1840. He was in no way happy about having the *Rules* revised under the supervision of Bishop Guy Chabrat. As he promised, Fr. Timon went to Bardstown in late

[22] Loc. cit.

[23] *Catalog of the Society of Jesus,* Province of France, 1836, p. 21. Cf. WOODSTOCK LETTERS 1 (1872), 124, for excerpt from this catalogue.

[24] Anna C. Minogue, *Loretto: Annals of a Century* (New York: America Press, 1912), p. 100.

[25] Timon to Chabrat, 1840, CAUA, N.D. John Timon, C.M., was the first Bishop of the Diocese of Buffalo.

[26] Charles G. Deuther, *Life and Times of John Timon, D.D.,* (Washington, D.C.: privately published, 1870), p. 75.

August, 1840, and together he and Bishop Flaget went to the Loretto Motherhouse for the purpose of Fr. Timon's reading the changes that had been made in the Rule of the Sisters of Loretto and making a revision *of the revision that had been made.* The complete history of this is set forth in the *U.S. [Loretto] Documents of the Propaganda Fide* in the Propaganda Fide Archives, Rome, Italy.

In 1846 the French Jesuits abandoned St. Mary's College and went to Fordham University. Fr. Fouché was named Procurator and he remained in this position for nine years. From 1856 to 1860 he was assigned to St. Francis Xavier College in New York; this college was then known as the Holy Name College. The change of names occurred in November 25, 1850, when the Jesuit students of Holy Name took up residence in the new and comfortable building which was named St. Francis Xavier College.[27] In making this transition both the Jesuit College and the Jesuit Holy Name Church lost their identity, and became known as St. Francis Xavier College and St. Francis Xavier Church.[28] The enrollment at the College, at this time, was about two hundred and fifty students. In the old records we sometimes find Fr. Fouché registered as Simon and again as Francis.

Montreal

In 1860 the growing college of Sainte-Marie in Montreal, Canada, needed help. At the time Fr. Simon Fouché was in need of the crisp Canadian air, due to an undiagnosed illness, which was bringing on a progressive deafness. So he was chosen to go to the Canadian College where his knowledge of French was a great asset.[29] However, the rapidly progressing deafness made it necessary for him to leave his duties as professor. So complete was the deafness he was unable even to hear confessions. In 1861 he was back at Fordham University as assistant Procurator, and in 1864 he was Librarian at St. Francis College and spiritual director of the community, a position which he held for six years. Two months before his death he

---

[27] Jardinis to Owens, Sept. 24, 1966.

[28] Cf. *The Catholic Directory* for these years; microfilm copies in Vatican Film Library, Pius XII Memorial Library, St. Louis University, St. Louis, Missouri.

[29] Jardinis to Owens, S.L., Sept. 24, 1966.

returned to Fordham University, where he died on January 29, 1870. According to a memorandum sent from Rev. Maurice A. Ahern, S.J., "He [Fr. Simon Fouché] spent some of his last years at St. Francis Xavier College in New York City."[30]

The "House Diary" of St. John's College, Fordham states: "June 29 [1870] Solemn distribution of awards in the usual manner. . . . At the eighth hour in the evening Reverend Father Fouché went to sleep in the Lord, at the age of 81. A man who was very religious and very lovable."[31] According to this same source "Father Fouché was buried on July 1 [1870]; many of the New York Fathers were present." He is buried in the little cemetery on the Fordham campus next to the Fordham University Church.

[30] Ahern to Owens, September 14, 1966.

[31] Archives of St. John's College, Fordham University, New York, N.Y.

THE JESUITS UNDER THE CZARS

to preserve the Society

Denis Dirscherl, S.J.

Cannons boomed in Pombal's Portugal while the ringing of bells and jubilation throughout Europe welcomed Clement XIV's signing of the brief *Dominus Ac Redemptor* which suppressed the Society of Jesus in 1773. Anticipating the demise of the Jesuits, Voltaire rejoiced in saying that "once we have destroyed the Jesuits we shall have the game in our hands." D'Alembert added: "The rest are nothing but Cossacks and Pandours, who will never stand firm against our disciplined troops." On hearing of the actual suppression of the Society, Voltaire laughed loudly and declared: "In twenty years there will be nothing left of the Church."

In Rome the mood was quite different. Realizing that he had succumbed to political blackmail, and thoroughly disturbed during a fit of despair, Clement declared, "I have cut off my right hand." The act by which the pope immobilized 23,000 Jesuits, their 800 residences, 700 colleges, and 300 missions, indeed, struck at the heart of the Church. The Brief of July 21st had been long in coming, for the Bourbon courts of France, Naples, Parma, and Spain had constantly pressured and threatened Clement from the very beginning of his reign in 1769. Harassed and deeply troubled, the pope finally surrendered to the intrigues of Charles III and his special envoy Florida Blanca. With the help of another Franciscan, Clement drafted the brief which "perpetually broke up and dissolved" the Society of Jesus:

We perceived that the Society of Jesus was no longer in a position to produce those rich fruits and remarkable benefits on account of which it was founded, approved and endowed with splendid privileges by so many popes; in the future it appears to be quite impossible to preserve a true and lasting peace within the Church so long as the Order exists. Guided by these weighty considerations and compelled by other reasons, which providence and the wise conduct of the whole Church suggest to us and which we guard in our breast . . . we hereby suppress the Society of Jesus after mature deliberations, with our infallible knowledge, and in the fullness of our apostolic power.[1]

By thus putting the Jesuits out of business with a few swipes of the pen Pope Clement blackened his name to such an extent that the entire history of the papacy "can show no other example of such craven cowardice."[2] Indeed, in the month following, when the Brief came into effect, the pope was deeply agitated, fainted, revived again, and as he sank onto his couch exclaimed: "I am damned. My home is Hell."[3]

In spite of *Dominus ac Redemptor*, the Society did not cease to function for a moment. The bulk of the Jesuits automatically became secular priests; in Austria and Germany they continued to live and teach in their old schools under the supervision of diocesan priests. And since the suppression was achieved by means of a brief instead of a papal bull, each state held an option on its promulgation. The bishops, furthermore, were not commanded to notify the religious, but only recommended to do so.

Resistance crumbled

At first the order received some breathing room in many states because of stiff resistance to the brief, but eventually the resistance crumbled. Poland held out from promulgating the brief for a lengthy spell. Catholics in Switzerland sent a letter of protest to the pope. Maria Theresa's Austria fought the issue before relenting to mounting pressure. The French hierarchy and clergy refused to accept the act of Clement. The Archbishop of Paris, Christopher de Beaumont,

---

[1] Friedrich Gontard, *The Chair of Peter* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964), p. 476.

[2] Henri Daniel-Rops, *The Church in the Eighteenth Century* (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1964), p. 218.

[3] Gontard, p. 476.

who had been signaled out to promulgate the brief by the pope, refused. In a letter of April 24, 1774, he stated that the condemnation involved merely personal judgment, that "the Brief which destroys the Society of Jesus is nothing else than an isolated, private and pernicious judgment, which does no honor to the tiara and is prejudicial to the glory of the Church and the growth and conservation of the Orthodox Faith."[4]

As a result of the suppression, new groups suddenly evolved throughout Europe, dedicating themselves to the Constitutions of Loyola as the "ex-Jesuits" regrouped in such communities as the "Society of the Heart of Jesus" which spread into Austria as well as the "Society of the Faith of Jesus" which extended into Austria, England, Holland, and Switzerland in spite of severe handicaps presented by bizarre leaders and circumstances.

But it was mainly to Protestant Prussia and Orthodox Russia that the Society owed its reprieve. Frederick II committed himself to protecting the religious orders, especially upon his annexation of the Silesian Province from Austria in the Seven Years' War. As he expressed his position, "since I am regarded as a heretic, the Holy Father can absolve me neither from keeping my promise nor from behaving as an honorable man and king."[5] Quite frankly Frederick was glad to have the Jesuits as teachers; otherwise he would have had to engage paid teachers to replace them. Nevertheless Frederick expressed true admiration for the order and was quick to acknowledge the talents of the Jesuits. In answering a criticism of Voltaire this respect is revealed: "There is not in our country a single learnd Catholic except among the Jesuits. We had no one capable of conducting the schools. It was, therefore, necessary either to retain the Jesuits or to allow education to fall into decay."[6]

More than any other reason or circumstance the Society owed the recouping of its strength and resources to Catherine the Great. When Catherine partitioned Poland in 1772 she thereby acquired territory surrounding Polotsk, Vitebsk, and Mogilev, including a

---

[4] Thomas Campbell, S.J., *The Jesuits* (1534–1921) (New York: The Encyclopedia Press, 1921), p. 590.

[5] Rene Fulop-Miller, *The Power and Secret of the Jesuits* (New York: Viking Press, 1930), p. 385.

[6] J. M. S. Daurignac, *History of the Society of Jesus* (Cincinnati: John P. Walsh, 1865), II, p. 195.

considerable Roman Catholic population. The Empress was particularly anxious to keep the Jesuits in their old schools and residences to preserve their educational endeavors. She also hoped that the Jesuits' presence would aid in conciliating the disaffected provinces that were annexed.

Previous activity

The Jesuits were no strangers to the policies and historical developments of the Russian Empire. Their activity reached back as far as the sixteenth century in the person of the Jesuit diplomat Antonio Possevino. Later was the Jesuit participation in the Union of Brest in 1595–96 as well as the controversial and questionable role that they played during the Russian "smuta" or "time of troubles."

While Peter the Great was embarking on his "westernization" of Russia, he permitted a modest Jesuit activity in Moscow. But since this permission was granted in good part through the gracious assistance of Peter's half-sister Sophia, the Jesuits were turned out after her death. In 1691 they were invited back to administer a church in Moscow. In 1719 as Peter grasped for full control over his empire he once more expelled the Jesuits. In 1740 under Czarina Anne, the Jesuits returned.

After the partition of Poland and the territorial incorporation into the Russian Empire, the Jesuits were still officially banned in Russia. Nevertheless, the Society was given free reign by Catherine in the dependencies. Roughly two hundred Jesuits became her subjects. One of Catherine's exotic plans was to incorporate the Poles into a separate and independent Catholic Church. Consequently she revoked the proscription of Peter the Great against the Society and drew up working conditions for the Jesuits in the old Polish territories.

Under the new dispensation numerous privileges, including exemption from taxation, were extended to the Society. In return the Jesuits were to administer the four colleges of Polotsk, Vitebsk, Orsha, and Dunaberg along with several other residences and fourteen missions. The Jesuits were so pleased with the cordial relations that they were confident that the Empress would not promulgate the brief of suppression. Catherine was bound by her promise to be the protector of the order. But in spite of these circumstances and while

expressing their deep gratitude to the Empress, the Jesuits requested that she promulgate the brief and allow the Society to cease functioning:

It is to Your Majesty that we owe the privilege of professing publicly the Roman Catholic Religion in your glorious states, and of depending in spiritual matters on the Sovereign Pontiff who is the visible head of our Church. That is the reason why we Jesuits, all of whom belong to the Roman Rite, but who are most faithful subjects of Your Majesty, now prostrate before your august imperial throne, implore Your Majesty by all that is most sacred to permit us to render prompt and public obedience to the authority which resides in the person of the Sovereign Roman Pontiff and to execute the edict he has sent us abolishing our Society. By condescending to have a public proclamation made of this Brief of Suppression, Your Majesty will thus exercise your royal authority, and we by promptly obeying will show ourselves obedient both to Your Majesty and to the Sovereign Pontiff who has ordered this proclamation. Such are the sentiment and the prayers of all and each of the Jesuits. . . .[7]

Catherine refused to heed the request of the Jesuits, and with the cooperation of the Polish Bishop Stanislas Siestrzencewicz, she founded the diocese of White Russia. The Empress also wrote and obtained a decree from Rome dated June 7, 1774, allowing the Jesuits to continue their work. In January 1776 Pius VI permitted the Jesuits to accept new novices and take in fathers from other provinces who were expelled because of the brief. And on August 9th of the same year the pope issued a decree empowering the Bishop of Mogilev to exercise jurisdiction over the Jesuits in accordance with the wishes of Catherine. By this move of putting the responsibility on the shoulders of the Polish prelate, the pope hoped to avoid the wrath and ill will of the European secular powers who were still adamant on utterly exterminating the Society. Nevertheless, the papal nuncio at Warsaw, Archetti, continued to take it upon himself to wage his own personal battle with the Bishop and the Jesuits, fortunately to little avail.

Good will

Catherine set the pattern for other nobles and dignitaries of her land by continuing to treat the Fathers with respect and good will, taking opportunities to visit the Jesuit residences on occasions, as for

[7] Campbell, p. 645.

instance in May 30, 1780, when along with her minister Potemkin and a large retinue, she spent some time at the college in Polotsk. There she was graciously and cermoniously received after a tour through the house and attendance at Mass.

On the many occasions when the Jesuits were questioned on how they continued to function as an order, the same ready reply was always at hand: the people needed them, Catherine allowed it, and with the knowledge and tacit consent of Rome. At the same time the provincial let it be known that the Society was ready to relinquish everything at the first authentic sign from the pope.

In a letter dated May 7, 1779, to Baron Grimm, an envoy at the court of France, Catherine expressed her motive for continuing to protect the Jesuits:

> Neither I nor my honorable rogues the Jesuits of White Russia are going to cause the Pope any worry. They are very submissive to him and want to do only what he wishes. I suppose it is you who wrote the article in the 'Gazette de Cologne' about the hot house (the Jesuit novitiate). You say that I am amusing myself by being kind to them. Assuredly, you credit me with a pretty motive, whereas I have no other than that of keeping my word and seeking the public good.

In 1782 the Society in Russia weathered several new storms and came off with an even stronger position. Partly through the influence of a former Jesuit, the Canon Benislawski, Potemkin became a willing benefactor to the Jesuits in their battles. Part of the new difficulties stemmed from the Polish prelate, Siestrzencewicz, who had become an Archbishop. There was some consternation among the Jesuits that he would attempt to take a stronger hand in influencing the Society. To strengthen these fears, the papal nuncio, Archetti, encouraged the Archbishop to take action. To thwart this possible danger, the Jesuits decided to elect their own Vicar General. Thanks to a ukase of June 23, 1782, the Empress stated that the fathers should be subject to the Archbishop in those matters that pertained to his jurisdiction or office but that he should not interfere with the internal affairs of the Society.

Archbishop vs. Empress

Archbishop Siestrzencewicz was duly disturbed by this favor to the order, and not realizing that the Jesuits had been favored through the intercession of Potemkin, he asked Prince Wiaziemski,

then President of the Senate, to procure a decree from his body subjecting the Jesuits to his wishes. The Senate so ruled, thus setting them in opposition to the Empress and her minister Potemkin.

On October 10, 1782, the Jesuits elected Fr. Stanislas Czerniewicz Vicar General of the Society who in turn named Fr. Francis Kareu Vice-Provincial. He then set out for St. Petersburg after being summoned there by Catherine. In the capital he was again reassured by Catherine: "I defended you thus far, and will do so till the end." At the same time Potemkin took the Archbishop to task for his meddling in the affairs of the Society and he was forced to modify his views.

Now that the Society had settled upon a new General, opened a novitiate and successfully settled affairs with the Archbishop and the Empress, it had to deal with Rome, since the foregoing was accomplished with only the tacit consent of Pope Pius VI. Fr. Czerniewicz was detained in St. Petersburg for more than three months discussing for much of the time the anticipated educational policies with both Catherine and Potemkin. More crucially, the new General had to make arrangements in order to obtain the explicit approval of Rome for the Jesuits' recent deliberations, chiefly the election of a new superior. The order itself was a little apprehensive about several of the expressions in the Acts of the Congregation, for instance, "the Brief of Clement XIV destroyed the Society outside of Russia," and "the Vicar was elected by the authority of the Holy See." The latter point was especially troublesome in that Archetti considered the election illegal. Uncertainty about the reaction of the Pope left some fear in the ranks of the Society.

To expedite these matters the Empress dispatched Fr. Benislawski in 1783 as her envoy to Rome to negotiate with the Pope. She warned him, moreover, not to modify the above decisions in any way. And in his audience with Pius, Benislawski was to obtain three approbations: 1) the recognition of Siestrzencewicz as Archbishop, 2) the appointment of Benislawski as his coadjutor, and 3) the approbation of the Jesuits in White Russia, and especially the approval for the election of the new General and approval of the Acts of the Congregation.

To fortify her case the Empress addressed a formal request to the Pope indicating her motives for protecting the Jesuits:

The motives for which I protect the Jesuits are founded on justice and reason, and also on the hope that they will be of use in my dominions. This Society of peaceful and innocent men continues to remain in my empire because among all the Catholic bodies, they are the best fitted to instruct my subjects, and to inspire them with sentiments of humanity and with the true principles of Christianity. I am resolved to support these priests against any power whatsoever, and in doing so I only fulfill my duty; for I am their sovereign, and I regard them as faithful, innocent, and useful subjects.[8]

Benislawski arrived in Rome on February 21, 1783, and met with the Pope on the same day. After a few inquiries, all his requests met with the Pope's approval.

A second audience

At a second audience the mood of the pope was decidedly different. In the meantime Bourbon envoys had influenced a negative reaction to Benislawski's requests. Recognizing the change, Benislawski dropped to his knees as if prepared to leave and asked for the pope's blessing. When the Pope inquired into the meaning of this sudden act, he was informed: "My orders are to withdraw immediately, if my requests are not granted."[9] Pius was so startled that he asked Benislawski to put his requests in writing.

Catherine's envoy spent the night drawing up the tract, anticipating the possible objections of the enemies of the Society and countering them with his own arguments. The thrust of his major argument suggested that

the failure of the bishop to abolish the Society in Russia, the establishment of the novitiate, and the election of the General were all due to the explicit and positive orders of Catherine. As she had threatened to persecute the Catholics of Russia and to compel the Poles to enter the Orthodox Church, it was clear that there was no choice but to submit to her demands.[10]

Benislawski argued that in case the Bourbon powers objected to the protection of the Society by Catherine, this could be countered by the fact that Catherine did not disapprove of their promulgation

[8] Barbara Neave, *The Jesuits: Their Foundation and History* (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1879), II, pp. 280–1.

[9] Campbell, p. 655.

[10] *Ibid.*

of the brief in their own lands. Also, the approval of the order was no reflection on the pope since he did not abolish the Society and had full rights to reverse the opinion of his predecessor. Moreover, the brief was never promulgated in Russia to begin with. The Empress' envoy also conveyed the solemn promise that if everything was settled properly Catherine would not harm the Catholics in her domain and that she felt that she could not inflict any greater harm than depriving her subjects of the services of the Jesuits whom she considered "invaluable."

In case the objection was raised that all these "machinations" were perpetrated at the instigation of the Jesuits, Benislawski was ready to remind the pope that the Jesuits themselves had petitioned the Empress to promulgate the papal brief. On the following day the pope read the requests and with a smile on his face said, "You want to arrange this matter by a debate with me. But there can be no answer to your contention. Your arguments are irrefutable."[11] And then in the presence of some Cardinals the Pontiff gave his verbal consent to the recognition of the Archbishop, the consecration of Benislawski, and as to the third question, raising his voice, he said: "Approbo Societatem Jesu in Alba Russia degentem; approbo, approbo."[12]

With their legal status thus established, the Jesuits continued the educational reforms that Catherine asked for in her schools, chief of which was the introduction of the physical sciences. Fr. Gruber complied by founding a training school for the preparation of future instructors and professors.

To the very end of her rule in 1796 Catherine remained cordial and just to the Society in Russia. Moreover, she engaged the Jesuit Fr. Gruber to tutor her son and next Czar, Paul. Times of prosperity were thus insured for the Society under Paul who ruled from 1796–1801. Besides the benefit of a personal interview with Pope Pius VI, Czar Paul was gracious to the Society in large part because of Fr. Gruber, a truly outstanding man, gifted in the technical sciences, engineering, chemistry, mechanics, architecture, painting as well as linguistic ability in French, German, Italian, and Russian. Indeed, much of the success of the Society was attributed to this one Jesuit

[11] Campbell, p. 656.
[12] *Ibid.*

who helped spearhead educational reforms in Russia. And from 1802–1805 until he was burned to death in his residence at St. Petersburg, Fr. Gruber served as General of the Society.

Under Paul

Under Paul the Society was permitted to expand and enlarge its colleges and novitiate, and serve at the University of Vilna. The relationship between Fr. Gruber and Czar Paul was so cordial that the Jesuit was reported to be able to procure almost any favor from him. Gruber even importuned Paul to intercede with the newly elected Pius VII to officially recognize the Society in Russia, heretofore existing on the non-promulgation of the rulers of Russia and the verbal consent of Pius VI. On August 11, 1800, Paul asked Pius to revoke the decree of Clement and officially establish the Society once more:

> The Reverend Father Gruber, the superior of the Jesuits in my states, has expressed to me the wish of the members of the Society of Jesus that I might obtain from Your Holiness their public recognition. I believe that I ought not to hesitate from such a duty, to beg for this order, for which I hold a special predilection, the explicit approval of Your Holiness.

The affirmative reply to Paul's letter came by way of the papal bull, *Catholicae Fidei,* on March 7, 1801, just several weeks before the assassination of the Emperor. Thus under Paul the Society was able to take the first important step towards its full restoration which came thirteen years later. After Paul's death Fr. Gruber persuaded the new Czar, Alexander I, to publish the bull of Pius VII.

In spite of these successes in Russia and though the Society began to recover some of its old strength and even extend itself along the Volga and into faraway Astrakhan and the Caucasus, conditions turned for the worse in Russia. Alexander became unpredictable, and when the new Father General (Brzozowski) was invited to Rome in 1814 to receive in person the bull of restoration, *Sollicitudo Omnium Ecclesiarum,* he was refused permission to leave Russia. This maneuver was an omen of worse things to come. And due to petty misunderstandings, bizarre notions, and plain power politics, Alexander issued a ukase dated December 25, 1815, proclaiming the expulsion of the Jesuits from Russia. The Jesuits were then restricted to the confines of White Russia. And on March 13, 1820,

with the death of General Brzozowski and the prospect that succeeding generals were to reside in Rome, Alexander extended his 1815 ban to include banishment from the entire Russian Empire. It was plain enough; the Jesuits were attracting too many Orthodox converts to Catholicism.

Thus for roughly half a century the three Czarist rulers played a crucial role in helping to preserve the Society. In large measure, it is clear, these rulers pledged themselves to protecting the Jesuits out of mere political expediency and for their own useful purposes albeit with true admiration for the talents and efficiency of the order. But when the Jesuits became too useful for their own good, they were expelled from the Russian Empire, indeed, with surprisingly little rancor and hostility.

DISCERNMENT AS A POLITICAL PROBLEM

the Ignatian art of government

MICHAEL SHEERAN, S.J.

YOU ARE PROVINCIAL of your province of the Society of Jesus. The figures on your desk make it clear that the supply of manpower is steadily falling off and will continue to do so for at least the next five years. The alternatives are two: continue to operate all present schools, relying on an increasing number of laymen and increased tuition to keep them going or withdraw entirely from some schools to be able to maintain the current number of Jesuits and current tuition in the others.

Let us suppose for the sake of the example that neither option has overwhelming evidence on its side. But this is a major decision involving the lives of a large number of people. What procedure would you follow in reaching a decision?

It is the goal of this paper to outline a possible approach to such situations. We will look first at the process of personal discernment of spirits in the Ignatian tradition. Then we will explore a possible application of discernment to group decision-making. We will suggest that such corporate discernment is not only consistent with the governmental structure of the Society of Jesus but even is the ordinary governmental method intended by Ignatius.

Principles and prescriptions

To achieve perspective, let us briefly trace the development of a concept akin to discernment, human prudence. For Plato, the human world was an imperfect mirror of the real universe. The supreme

characteristic of this ideal universe was its complete intelligibility. To live rightly, man had only to deduce from the perfect world the principles which applied to his current situation. In every situation there was a single right solution: only ignorance hindered man's perfect acting out of the principles which covered his situation. In his political philosophy, therefore, Plato opted for a government by the men who were most adept at making deductions from the ideal world, the philosophers.[1]

Aristotle replaced the Platonic ideal universe by positing a nature within each being, thus retaining the Platonic premise that objective principles applicable to given situations can be deduced from a knowledge of the nature of each of the beings in the situation. He was much more ready than Plato, however, to admit that it is sometimes impossible to completely know the situation—either through complexity or ineptitude—and that a gap can therefore be expected to exist between the principles one can adduce and the fullness of the reality contained in the situation.

To meet this gap, Aristotle introduced *prudence*, the ability to choose well between options when reason fails to provide criteria for the choice. We will not try to follow the historical development of this concept, but do wish to underscore from the beginning that prudence is by definition a quality which excels mere rationality, which is operative precisely when rational deliberation is inadequate to deal with a situation.[2]

Aquinas introduced a radically new dimension. By positing the analogy of being, he was affirming that a concrete existent is more than can be expressed in formal statements, that man's uniqueness cannot be dismissed as the negative limitation (prime matter) which individuates his essence (substantial form). We can thus know more about a man than we can verbalize. His precise personal dignity is a

---

[1] We are concerned here with the thrust of the political writings in particular. Generally, Plato ignores the possibility of a situation not capable of fully rational solution. Curiously, the Daimonon of *Apology*. 40. A–C is the closest approximation to Ignatius's discernment for the first time of making an election that the writer has encountered in philosophical works.

[2] Again, our interest is in a part of the total picture. Aristotle uses "prudence" in a much wider sense than we describe here; his inclusion of the sense we describe is significant. Cf. *Nichomachean Ethics*. VI, v, 6; VI, vii, 7.

positive quality which cannot be fully captured in any group of abstractions.[3]

The conclusion following from this new dimension is important: any concrete individual man has both formal and individual characteristics. He therefore is subject to two kinds of obligations: first, those that can be deduced from rational consideration of his formal nature and the natures of the beings he encounters in a given situation. Second, those that derive from his unique personal character but which, being concrete, are not subject to formal rational processes involving abstraction, univocal reasoning, etc. The former obligations we arbitrarily dub, "principles," the latter, "prescriptions." Karl Rahner writes, "On Thomistic principles, then, with the best will in the world, one cannot deny on principle that there can be individual prescriptive norms which are in the proper sense unique."[4]

One key difference

It is important to underscore one key difference between this approach and situationism. In situation ethics, the individual element can conflict with and override the abstract principle which applies. The Thomistic presentation, however, begins with the principle of the unity of the individual. Hence it is contradictory to posit prescriptions which would contravene applicable principles; for this is tantamount to asserting that the individual's nature is opposed to his personal quality, i.e., that he is not a unity. Prescriptions thus come into play only when principles do not adequately delineate the appropriate action in a given situation, and no avenue of conduct can be justified as prescription if it contradicts a principle.

We can sum up prudence, then, as the ability to reach correct prescriptions. It is employed when the issue is too complex to weigh all principles accurately (Aristotle's explanation),[5] or when it is impossible to solve problems with moral principles because the situation is larger than the principles (Thomism's addition).

With all this as preparation, we have hopefully equipped the reader to readily comprehend the meaning of our primary interest,

[3] Karl Rahner, S.J. *The Dynamic Element In The Church* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1964), p. 16.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 17.

[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 28–29.

discernment. Discernment is simply the supernatural equivalent of prudence. It is the capacity to discover the concrete divine will in a given situation in which reason (principles) does not make that divine will clear.

There is really no reason to prove that such discernment is possible. The experience of Christian men through the centuries leaves little doubt that such discernment is a reliable, if difficult, procedure. It is our job rather to do two things: first, we must describe the kind of problem that requires discernment; then we must indicate as best we can how discernment, both individual and corporate, operates. Hopefully, this section has achieved the first of these goals. If so, the implications of the following summary statement will be clear: What God wishes to be done in certain given circumstances cannot be logically and unequivocally deduced from the general principles of dogma and morals, even with the help of an analysis of the given situation. Such theoretical considerations may delimit the sphere of the correct and appropriate human action (in many cases to such an extent that it will be clear in practice what should be done) and therefore will always be necessary. Nevertheless, they are fundamentally incapable of determining which of the various decisions within this sphere is in fact the one God wills at this moment, and how this one can be found.[6]

What is discernment?

(A) *The first week of the exercises: removing inordinate affections which tempt us not to follow objective truths.* The lazy mind all too easily gives up the conscientious search for applicable principles and asks prescriptions to do what they ought not do: take the place of applicable principles. If honest discernment is to be achieved, therefore, the first step, the use of reason, cannot be bypassed. St. Ignatius observes that the chief impediment to the use of reason is a man's emotional attachments, fears, acquisitiveness, etc. These attachments are so many potential short-circuits which prevent honest reasoning. His immediate goal, therefore, is that "no decision is made under the influence of any inordinate attachment."[7]

---

[6] Karl Rahner, S.J. *Visions And Prophecies* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1963), p. 26.

[7] Louis J. Puhl, S.J., trans. *The Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius* (Westminster, Md.: Newman, 1957), 21. All English translations of the *Exercises* will be taken from this translation.

The process of eliminating inordinate attachments has something in common with the sort of discernment which corresponds to prudence: both deal with non-rational human responses to a decision-making situation. Because of this relationship and because the two processes are often intertwined, Ignatius chooses to describe both as "discernment," although he honors their distinction by speaking of a discernment "more suited to the first week"[8] and a discernment "more suitable for the second."[9] The Rules for Discernment in the first week tend generally to discernment in the broad sense: clearing away inordinate affections impeding the use of reason. Ignatius's examples in this group rather clearly presuppose that the person is dealing with temptations not to do what is known to be objectively right. His examples build around the attempt to free oneself from mortal sin,[10] the vulnerability of a man who loses courage in face of clear temptations[11] or who hides clear temptations from his confessor.[12] Other paragraphs in these rules, of course, are equally applicable to both first and second week. But within the context of the Rules for the First Week taken alone, these paragraphs are applied by Ignatius to the prime task of the first week, discernment in the broad sense, the elimination of obstacles to honest reasoning.

(B) *The second week of the exercises: discernment in the narrow sense—finding god's concrete will when more than one course of action is legitimate.* Discernment in the narrower sense, the choice among equally reasonable options, is reserved by Ignatius to the second week. These Rules for the Second Week are not to be proposed to individuals who are unable to control their obviously immoral attachments,[13] but should be introduced when their affections are in order and they are already choosing among options they see as good, i.e., reasonable.[14] The general concern of the Rules for the First Week, then, is principles, that of the Rules for the Second Week, prescriptions.[15]

---

[8] *SpEx,* 313.
[9] *SpEx,* 328.
[10] *SpEx,* 314–315.
[11] *SpEx,* 325.
[12] *SpEx,* 326.
[13] *SpEx,* 9.
[14] *SpEx,* 10, 170.
[15] K. Rahner, *Dynamic,* p. 131.

Admittedly, no one ever completely eliminates the tendency of disordered affections to cloud reason. In the second week, therefore, discernment in the broad sense is still very much operative, even if the main thrust is to the prescriptions of discernment in the narrow sense.

Roustang

We emphasize this point because the relative importance of these two very different elements helps to explain significant differences in the explanations of the discernment process of the second week which reputable spiritual writers offer. Roustang, for example, seems to see few situations in which reason, if freed from inordinate attachments, would be unable to solve problems with principles alone. He is at his best when advising on how subtle attachments can color our rational analysis. But he seems to let his viewpoint overshadow some basic Ignatian teachings. So suspect does Roustang find Ignatius's first time of making an election (when there is such certitude that one has neither hesitation about whether God is speaking nor "the possibility of hesitation"[16]), that Roustang warns: "The divine intervention . . . takes place at such a depth that we will never perhaps be able to realize it except in its consequences."[17]

Concerning the second time for making an election (when motion of the spirits is used to find God's will), Roustang is especially helpful in suggesting that a check on one's discernment is whether the action would make mankind grow because the choice "respects the laws of things and beings";[18] and he strongly counsels delay in making decisions to allow for reflection, for reasoning.[19] But again, he is deficient in that his suggested norm only tells whether the option is consistent with *principles.* Nowhere does Roustang suggest how one might get at *prescriptions.* Even his most detailed descriptions of the process of discernment are reducible to bringing one's emotions into harmony with the already determined (rationally) right course of action.[20]

---

[16] *SpEx,* 175.

[17] Francois Roustang, S.J. *Growth In the Spirit* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1966), p. 130.

[18] *Ibid.,* p. 139.

[19] *Ibid.,* p. 140.

[20] *Ibid.,* pp. 131–132.

Roustang's advice on discernment, then, is excellent for the practitioner of the first week; it lacks the positive sort of discernment between two objective goods which is the heart of the second week. In short, he fails to take into account that concrete situations surpass the objective norms which apply to them.

If we are to beware Roustang's approach, then, how are we to proceed? When reason reveals only that various options are praiseworthy, how *do* we find which option is God's vocation to us? Ignatius's three times of making an election [21] and his rules for discernment for the second week [22] are not very clear about the heart of the process which is involved. The present writer will therefore rely on Karl Rahner's presentation and ask the reader to make up his own mind whether the explanation is helpful by comparing it with his own religious experience.

Openness and horizon

(1) *The core experience:* We begin by turning to an experience that each of us has had in one form or another. Recall any of the moments when you equivalently threw open your arms before God, when you experienced yourself as totally his, as simply and completely at his disposal. You were at peace, tranquil, felt a sense of harmony. More important, if you reflect carefully on the event, you recall the complete confidence that your experience was a valid one. At the moment of the event, there was no doubt: the loving God to whom you were open was really present to you, accepting your offering of yourself and, in the encounter, bringing you peace.

It is not important here whether you went through a process of reasoning prior to the experience; the key issue is that, whatever the circumstances, at the time you *experienced* this most basic openness to the loving God. Such experience, either directly of God or mediated through the life of Christ, is the bed rock upon which all discernment builds. Ignatius comments:

During the exercises of the Election, the exercitant should not direct his attention simply to the movement of spirits going on within him, but rather to the love of God which both precedes and accompanies all move-

---

[21] *SpEx,* 175–178.

[22] *SpEx,* 328ff.

ments of soul—and he will do this by continuing to contemplate the mysteries of the life of Christ.[23]

At the risk of being overly abstract, we may briefly summarize in technical terminology Rahner's explanation of the nature of this core experience of openness to God by saying that God is here experienced as the horizon of our knowledge and love, the non-conceptualizable concrete transcendent which forms a background of "light" in front of which every conceptual (and therefore created) object stands illumined.[24]

This event, unlike conceptual knowledge of God, is experienced as not capable of being deceptive:

> It is plainly the case that such an experience bears its own warrant, that regarded purely in itself, it cannot deceive and that in it God himself is present and nothing else can be. . . . Because [the experience] is the condition of the possibility of all cognition, it is without error, and is the ultimate certitude.[25]

Concrete perception

(2) *The first time of making an election: "When God our Lord so moves and attracts the will that a devout soul without hesitation, or the possibility of hesitation, follows what has been manifested to it. St. Paul and St. Matthew acted thus in following Christ our Lord."*[26] We have just discussed the core experience which underlies Ignatian discernment. The first time of making an election occurs when one discovers the core experience to be indissolubly linked with a concrete option. One apprehends the transcendent to whom he is fully open as concretized in the particular option before him. There is no reasoning. The openness to God is a non-conceptual event. The option, because particularized, is also apprehended non-conceptually, i.e., as concrete, not under its universal notes. "The experience [of transcendence], by a decisive influence of God, finds concrete expression in the proposition, judgment, precept, and so on

---

[23] Hugo Rahner, S.J. *Ignatius the Theologian* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1968), p. 146. This is apparently a paraphrase of a remark in the official *Directory*, XXX, 3 (p. 717).

[24] K. Rahner, *Dynamic*, p. 145.

[25] *Ibid.*, pp. 148–149.

[26] *SpEx*, 175.

of the predicamental order."[27] The first time adds to the core experience, therefore, a concrete option which is apprehended as expressing the core experience.

This, of course, sounds extremely subtle, and therefore we tend to think it is not for us. It is well to remember that this first mode of making an election was fairly common among ordinary early Jesuits.[28] In addition, the characteristically Jesuit practice of finding God in all things seems to grow directly from the basic experience of the first time of making an election: each person or thing I encounter becomes the object through which I move to the horizon.[29] For in this joining of concrete object with transcendent horizon, we have the "pure non-conceptual light of the consolation of the whole human person who is being drawn above and beyond all that can be named into the love of God."[30]

The reason, of course, why it is so hard to communicate what goes on is that we feel forced to employ such terms as, "horizon," "transcendent," "non-conceptual," etc. These terms are useful in reminding us that, although the process is non-rational, it is nonetheless intellectual. Ignatius preferred to speak analogically, referring in his writings to such an event in the terms of sense-level activity. This tends to be particularly useful since intellectual non-conceptual joy tends to be accompanied by sense-level joyful emotions, etc. It is also dangerous, of course, if one has not learned to differentiate between the two related kinds of experience. Ignatius's description of the first time of election illustrates his predilection for sense-level terminology:

> There still remains for us to speak of what we are to think of those things the direct origin of which from God we interiorly perceive, and how we are to use them. It frequently happens that the Lord himself moves our soul and constrains us as it were to this or that action by making our soul wide open. That is to say, he begins to speak within us without any sound of words [Words are the sense-level equivalent of concepts.], he draws up the soul wholly to his love and gives us a sense of himself, so that even if we wished, we could not resist.[31]

---

[27] K. Rahner, *Dynamic*, p. 159, n.
[28] H. Rahner, *Ignatius*, p. 145.
[29] K. Rahner, *Dynamic*, pp. 155–156.
[30] *Ibid.*, p. 137.
[31] *Monumenta Ignatiana* I, 105; quoted in K. Rahner, *Dynamic*, p. 152.

To clarify our point, we turn to Hugo Rahner's analysis of Ignatian use of *"sentire."* This key word has "nothing to do with any emotional, let alone sensual impressions; it is a completely intellectual mode of cognition, though it is certainly higher than discursive reasoning and must be ranked among the 'spiritual senses.' "[32] If anything, Hugo Rahner overstates his case here, ruling out any sense-level concomitants of the primarily intellectual *"sentire."*[33]

One final clarification. Ignatius's suggestion that the knowledge of the first mode of election is "without cause" has been often interpreted as meaning that the consolation arises very suddenly. Particularly in our day, when the powers of the subconscious are known and respected, this kind of norm is suspect. Karl Rahner urges that the lack of cause be taken as pointing to the peculiar non-conceptuality of the perception of God as horizon. Since knowledge derived from a created source must involve concepts, no creature can be perceived as horizon of knowledge. This avoids the objection and, more importantly, underscores the Ignatian criterion for validity: there can be no doubt; the unique knowledge is self-validating.[34]

(3) *The second time of making an election: "When much light and understanding are derived through experience of desolations and consolations and discernment of diverse spirits."*[35] An election in the second time is not blessed with the certitude of the first time, but shares with it the characteristic that no reasoning is involved. One begins by either renewing his experience of openness to God or, if that proves impossible, by recalling it. He concentrates on how he feels in that situation, on the peace, harmony, tranquillity which accompany the event. It is important to recall that we mean what we say. Peace, harmony, tranquillity are the keys. The sweep of emotional joy or deep sadness which may also accompany this submission to God are not to be confused with the basic, primarily intellectual, sense of peace.[36]

---

[32] H. Rahner, *Ignatius,* p. 147.

[33] Cf. John Futrell, S.J. *Making an Apostolic Community of Love: The Role of the Superior According to St. Ignatius Loyola* (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, n.d.) I, 294–296. Futrell provides a much broader view than Rahner.

[34] K. Rahner, *Dynamic,* pp. 141–2, 149.

[35] *SpEx,* 176.

[36] H. Rahner, *Ignatius,* p. 152 cites five marks of the presence of divine con-

One then considers each of the options open to him. He projects himself into the possible situations, then assesses his reactions. He looks, in each option, for something of the peace and tranquillity of the central experience of openness. Over and over again he considers the options, letting time intervene between examinations and carefully distinguishing such transient *sensibilia* as happiness or sorrow from the basic sense of harmony which may accompany them. Karl Rahner suggests, "The *experiencia*[37] of the second mode of election is a 'trial,' an experimenting at one's own risk and peril, whether and how the central religious experience coheres with such and such limited, predicamental objects."[38]

It is important to remember the trial and error which characterize this mode of discernment. Roustang comments, "No criterion enables us to recognize with certainty, at any given moment, the origin of a particular sentiment."[39] Rahner's capsule explanation of the second time, "being consoled on account of a certain defined limited object,"[40] is therefore correct, but one must take "being consoled" to mean experiencing movements of soul accompanied by peace, tranquillity, harmony rather than to take consolation as we often do in the sense of *any* happiness or enthusiasm.[41]

The second time of election, then, is an operation "sine ratiociniis"[42]; it is the "logic of concrete particulars."[43] And it begins with

---

solation which are listed in the *Directorium Autographum* II: interior peace, spiritual joy, hope and faith and charity, tears, elevation of mind. In *SpEx,* 336, Ignatius adds "warmth and favor." In 333, one finds a much narrower usage, "peace, tranquillity, and quiet." In light of the danger of confusing sense-level aspects of consolation with intellectual consolation, we have preferred to limit ourselves to the usage of #333 since these terms are somewhat easier to disengage from sense experience than, e.g., "elevation of mind" or "warmth and favor." Since "quiet" often connotes that nothing is happening in our culture, we have chosen the parallel but more dynamic term, "harmony" to express it more accurately to our generation. Curiously, Karl Rahner seems to have a predilection for this term. Cf. *Dynamic,* pp. 150, n.; 158; 166.

[37] *SpEx,* 176.

[38] K. Rahner, *Dynamic,* p. 159 note.

[39] Roustang, *Growth,* p. 100.

[40] K. Rahner, *Dynamic,* p. 137.

[41] Cf. *SpEx,* 316.

[42] H. Rahner, *Ignatius,* p. 146.

[43] K. Rahner, *Dynamic,* p. 142.

the central experience of "love for God which has inspired all these movements within [the person] in the first place."[44]

A substitute

(4) *The third time of making an election: "This is a time of tranquillity. One considers first for what purpose man is born. . . . With the desire to attain this before his mind, he chooses as a means to this end a kind of life . . . within the bounds of the Church that will be a help in the service of his Lord and for the salvation of his soul."*[45] We note that this method is definitely a substitute in the eyes of Ignatius.[46] The person must be satisfied to find an option which will be "a help" in serving God;[47] he has no right to expect to discover the *best* concrete option. However Ignatius does attempt to make the best of a difficult situation with his two suggested procedures for making a choice in the third time. The first of these seeks to reason carefully to be sure the weightier principles, if there are any, are accepted.[48] The second suggestion is that the individual use his imagination to project himself into concrete situations where he can size up the choices on more than the rational level. The devices of pretending to advise a stranger,[49] pretending it is the moment of death[50] or that I stand before God my judge[51] are really so many helpful techniques for turning the third time of election into a form of the second.[52] If the individual suceessfully enters those situations, there is hope that "the congruence [between fundamental attitude of openness to God and particular decision] is to be understood as experienced by the exercitant, not as estimated by deliberate evaluation with the object as the starting point."[53] In other words, we reach our conclusion because we feel peace in it, not because it is merely reasonable. It was in this sense that Davila, an early commentator,

---

[44] H. Rahner, *Ignatius,* p. 153.
[45] *SpEx,* 177.
[46] H. Rahner, *Ignatius,* p. 145.
[47] *SpEx,* 177.
[48] *SpEx,* 182.
[49] *SpEx,* 185.
[50] *SpEx,* 186.
[51] *SpEx,* 187.
[52] K. Rahner, *Dynamic,* p. 161 n.
[53] *Ibid.,* p. 163.

remarked that the third time is "illuminated and ratified by influences from the Second Time."[54]

Taken alone, then, the third time is most suspicious and unsatisfactory to Ignatius.[55] At best, the third time is "a deficient form of the Second."[56]

(5) *What are the "spirits" we are discerning?* A standard objection of contemporary man can now be dealt with. Must one posit divers spirits or spiritual influences behind each of the movements he experiences when attempting discernment? The answer is a qualified no. From our explanation, it should be clear that only two kinds of movements need to be attributed to a spirit. First is the central experience of our openness to God. In the very experiencing, we know that our experience of harmony with God is valid. Second come the occasions on which we discover a congruence between our concrete possibilities and that core experience. The peace, tranquillity, harmony are signs of the divine communication.

All other reactions and experiences, be they total exultation, absolute dejection, confusion—so long as they are not accompanied by peace and harmony—are simply not instances of divine communication. One is free to attribute them to spirits, to the psyche, to indigestion. The important task of the individual is really not to determine the exact source of such feelings but only to note that God is not in them and to seek feelings in which he does present himself by the sort of peace which is the hallmark of the core experience.[57]

Failure to receive

(6) *When discernment draws a blank:* When the second time fails for lack of experiences in which one discovers resonances of the core experience, it is always quite possible that "this is simply a sign that this object of election and its contrary are indifferent as regards an individual religious decision."[58] Many things are equally apt ways of serving God, especially when they are not significant issues in one's life. "Such things are not to be subjected to the method of

---

[54] H. Rahner, *Ignatius,* p. 155.
[55] K. Rahner, *Dynamic,* p. 95.
[56] *Ibid.,* p. 103.
[57] *Ibid.,* pp. 120, 163–164.
[58] *Ibid.,* p. 167.

election which we have described."[59] We must note, however, that Ignatius attributes three possible causes to failure to receive such divine direction: our negligence in prayer, God's desire to test us, and his desire to show us our spiritual dependence on him.[60] These possibilities, particularly that of negligence in prayer, must be considered seriously. The man who rarely prays can hardly expect to become adept at discernment.

(7) *Discernment before Ignatius:* In one form or another, discernment is a traditional component of Christian spirituality. Suarez traces parallels between Ignatius and Aquinas, Bonaventure, and Athanasius's *Life of St. Antony.*[61] Davila even notes Aquinas' citation of Aristotle to the effect that, if one is enlightened by a divine impulse, it is unnecessary to use reason, a lower norm, for further counsel.[62] The *Didache* provides a basic criterion for judging whether a person who claims the power of discernment is really in touch with God: "Not every man who speaks in the spirit is a prophet, but only if his life is modelled on that of Christ."[63] Finally, throughout the ascetical writings of many of the Fathers of the Church, one can trace a basic analogy describing types of discernment: Christians are urged to "distinguish the genuine from the counterfeit like shrewd money-changers."[64]

Ironically, the tradition of discernment is so strong that many commentators note only that Ignatius's description is remarkably conformed to the tradition even though he was virtually unaware of that tradition in his early years of spiritual experience. What such writers often overlook is the special characteristic of Ignatian discernment: unlike its predecessors, Ignatian discernment explicitly seeks guidance in discovering God's will *qua* particular.[65]

Corporate discernment

If we have done our work well, this section of the paper need not be especially lengthy. The transition from individual discernment

[59] *Ibid.*, p. 165.
[60] *SpEx*, 322.
[61] H. Rahner, *Ignatius*, p. 165.
[62] *Ibid.*, p. 148.
[63] *Ibid.*, p. 166.
[64] *Ibid.*, p. 172.
[65] K. Rahner, *Dynamic*, pp. 115–116.

to corporate discernment, although perhaps quite difficult in practice, is relatively easy to outline. We will be satisfied to demonstrate that group discernment is in fact a solid part of the tradition of the Society of Jesus and then to suggest one procedure for bringing this discernment to life in our own times.

(A) *Corporate discernment as origin of the Society:* In the early stages of its formation, the Society evolved through a fairly well delineated series of key decisions. Each of these decisions was an evidence of corporate application of the process of discernment which we have outlined in the preceding section. This mode of decision-making antedates the vow at Montmartre:

> During discussions of their ideals and their hopes and dreams, the companions, inevitably, had experienced the necessity imposed upon each of them individually to submit his own judgment to the control of their collective discernment of their apostolic mission. . . . Through sharing their subjective interior experiences, the companions were enabled to arrive at a common judgment of the will of God for them in the objective situation in which they found themselves in 1534.[66]

Rodriguez tells us the decision to vow poverty and chastity and go to Jerusalem was reached "longam post disputationem."[67]

During the time in Italy following the Montmartre vow, the comrades settled on the name, Company of Jesus, "after prayer and discussion."[68]

March to Mid-June of 1539 saw the "Prima Deliberatio," an informal congress of the comrades to discuss the now essential issue of whether to remain in close union, its corollary, whether to take a vow of obedience to one of their number, and other related questions. Futrell summarizes their procedure in treating the obedience problem:

(1) They gave themselves up even more intensely to prayer for light, "in invitendo gaudium et pacem in Spiritu Sancto circa obedientiam."

(2) During this period of personal prayer and discernment, they did not talk to each other, but sought personal light from the Holy Spirit.

(3) Taking care to achieve as complete objectivity as possible by considering himself apart from the Company, each one, after this prayer

---

[66] Futrell, *Making*, pp. 38 and 40.

[67] *Ibid.*, p. 39, quoting *Fontes Narrativae*, III, 20.

[68] *Ibid.*, p. 44.

and discernment, decided in all freedom his own conclusion concerning the question of obedience as a means to the greater future service of God and the conservation of the Company.

(4) During the period of mutual discernment, each one, with all simplicity and frankness, first stated the reasons against obedience which he had found through his own prayer and considerations; then, he outlined the reasons he saw in favor of it.[69]

The pattern was typical of all subsequent decision-making at this congress of the Companions: "Seruato similiter eodem ordine discutiendi et procedendi in reliquis omnibus . . ., omnia suaviter et concordi animorum consensu terminata ac finita sunt."[70]

(B) The *Constitutions*: It would be unnecessary and inappropriate here to trace how Ignatius interwove the procedure of group discernment into the *Constitutions* of the Society. We refer the reader who wishes to pursue the matter to Fr. John Futrell's forthcoming study. It is appropriate to comment that Ignatius built the hierarchical structure and procedures of the Society by relating two independent sources, "*pactista*" and discernment. The Spanish theory of "*pactista*," wherein the king rules by the authorization of the people, became the base for the General's authority. The procedure for exercising authority was to be discernment, both individual and corporate, as circumstances warranted.[71]

A contemporary technique

(C) *A basic structure for group discernment:* We are now in a position to move from our historical survey and suggest one contemporary technique of group discernment. We presume there is a problem which affects a number of members of the Society and which is open to more than one reasonable solution.

(1) The superior presents the problem and all relevant data to all whom it affects.

(2) He asks each to pray privately over the options, weighing the possibilities in terms of the peace he finds in each, looking in each for the harmony which reflects his core experience of openness to God.[72]

[69] *Ibid.*, p. 49, summarizing *Monumenta Ignatiana, Const.* I, 5.

[70] *Ibid.*, p. 51, quoting *Monumenta Ignatiana, Const.* I, 7.

[71] *Ibid.*, pp. 136–145.

[72] Since we are here dealing with one's openness not only as an individual

(3) The superior enters into dialogue with each, seeking his independent opinion.

(4) He looks for a pattern or trend in the opinions proffered, giving greater weight to the ideas of men whom experience has proved more adept at discernment.[73]

(5) He then should report back to all the consensus or lack thereof.

(6) The superior should seek some confirmation of the decision, e.g., papal approval, increased happiness of the men themselves, success of the decision when put into practice.[74]

We call attention to three points which need emphasis: First, the procedure accepts the principle that the concrete direct knowledge of the individuals far exceeds what is possible to the superior alone. Second, the principle that the Spirit speaks in individuals is clearly honored. Third, on a purely psychological level, all members of the group tend to acquiesce because they realize that the decision reflects group effort and is not simply imposed "from without" by the superior.

(D) *Implications of the element of uncertainty:* In speaking of discernment, Ignatius has no illusions that the prescriptions concluded to by either individual or group will be necessarily infallible. His term for such conclusions is *paraçer,* "an opinion resulting from one's personal assessment of 'appearances.'"[75] From this fact it follows that the superior should seek more group discernment as he finds the decision more difficult to make alone with confidence.[76] Rather obviously, the superior should let the judgments of those "on the spot" or "in the know" outweigh his own conclusions when he lacks their understanding.[77]

---

but also as a member of the group, this individual discernment will be in terms of the Society's basic commitment as enunciated most simply but profoundly in the "Scopus Vocationis Nostrae": "the service of Christ through the aid of souls in companionship." *Ibid.,* p. 65.

[73] *Ibid.,* p. 340, citing *Monumenta Ignatiana, Const.* I, 218–219.

[74] Cf. *Ibid.,* pp. 387–388.

[75] *Ibid.,* p. 282.

[76] *Ibid.,* p. 340, citing *Monumenta Ignatiana, Const.* I, 218-219.

[77] *Ibid.,* p. 289 and 65, n. 137.

But on the other side, the subject must accept the superior's *paraçer* when imposed. It is important to realize, however, that the superior's *paraçer* is to be accepted as a furtherance of the *unity* of the Society rather than because the superior is any more likely to be right.[78]

A concrete example will help here. Ignatius, after careful discernment, attempted to resign as general. All but one, Ovieda, after discernment, refused to hear of it. Ignatius acquiesced.[79] The incident illustrates a working principle of Ignatius as superior: when the community has faithfully followed the procedure of corporate discernment and has reached consensus other than the *paraçer* of the superior, the superior should give in in face of the higher probability that the Spirit is speaking through the community.

A final corollary: not only should the superior be personally adept at discernment of spirits, he should be capable of leading group discernment in the sense that he has a charism for helping the subjects discern the will of God for them individually and for the community.[80]

An Ignatian approach

We return at last to the question of whether to withdraw some men from each high school in order to keep all open or to remove all men from some schools to keep the remainder operating with a full complement of Jesuit manpower. The provincial would probably appoint a committee to develop the implications in terms of extent of manpower crisis, monetary considerations, impact of each option on the communities we serve, etc. A report relaying all this data would be prepared for each Jesuit in high school work or otherwise directly affected by the decision. Each man would be asked to pray privately over the matter, considering to what extent each option brings the basic peace, tranquillity, and harmony which are characteristic of his core experience of openness to God.

One or two meetings in each community might be helpful follow-

---

[78] *Ibid.*, pp. 138 and 289.

[79] *Ibid.*, p. 163.

[80] Richard F. Smith, S.J.: Lecture of February 27, 1969, describing superior as the member of the community with a "charismatic eye on God and the community." Fr. Smith was describing St. Basil's concept of the superior; the parallel to Ignatius's position is unmistakable.

ing this period of private discernment. Here all the advantages of the first option would be developed by the group, then all the disadvantages. The second option would be covered in like manner. Then more time would be allotted for individual prayerful discernment.

The provincial would then use his annual visitation to inquire from each man what his reactions are. Weighting the "*paraçer*" of those men whose past discernment has been more readily proved right by experience, he seeks a pattern, an indication of consensus. If the pattern is widespread enough to be significant, he agrees to it. If there is no significant pattern, he makes the decision that seems best to him. His decision is to be accepted by the group more to maintain corporate union and solidarity than because his "*paraçer*" is privileged.

Clearly this process is open to great variation depending on the time available, the number of men involved, the kind of issue in question. Part of the provincial's charism of guiding corporate discernment is the ability to adjust to these factors. In the present case, for example, it would be wise to keep all in the dark about what high schools would be most likely closed if that option were selected. The provincial thereby helps the group guard against false *paraçeres* deriving from an inordinate attachment to their own institutions.

Prayer

The procedure of individual and corporate discernment is now, hopefully, relatively clear. In closing, let us recall that the success of either type of discernment is dependent most directly on whether the men involved are men of prayer. Corporate discernment is by no means a mystical privilege reserved to specially blessed communities. But neither is it the automatic possession of every Jesuit community. The first reason why we are likely to suffer desolation, says Ignatius, is "because we have been tepid and slothful or negligent in our exercises of piety, and so through our own fault spiritual consolation has been taken away from us."[81] Discernment is, then, open to us; but we must regularly open ourselves to God in prayer if we are to make use of it.

---

[81] *SpEx*, 322.

THE BUFFALO MISSION: 1869–1969

The following selections have been forwarded to WOODSTOCK LETTERS through the kindness of Henry H. Regnet, S.J., the "Benjamin survivor of the Buffalo Mission." Readers will be interested in (I) an historical timetable of the Mission; (II) a list of the survivors of the Mission; (III) a joint letter of the German Provincials of the Society of Jesus on the occasion of the centennial of the Mission's founding; (IV) the sermon preached at St. Michael's Church, in Buffalo, at the centenary celebration, by Francis X. Curran, S.J., of Fordham University.

For the early history of the Buffalo Mission, consult WOODSTOCK LETTERS 1 (1872) and 5 (1908).

(I)

The Buffalo Mission

1869—Jesuits from the German Province of the Society of Jesus came to Buffalo on July 4th and took over St. Michael's and St. Ann's parishes. St. Mary's parish in Toledo, Ohio was staffed within a year.

1870—In the Fall Canisius College opened as a small secondary school. St. Joseph's parish in Erie, Pa. was accepted and administered till 1873.

1873—St. John's parish in Burlington, Iowa was taken over. It continued as a Jesuit parish till 1890.

1874—Sts. Peter and Paul parish in Mankato, Minn. was accepted. A small high school was conducted there from 1876–1881.

1880—Sacred Heart College was begun in Prairie du Chien, Wisconsin. It was suppressed 1888–1898. (In 1914 the name was changed to Campion College.) St. Gabriel's parish was staffed in 1880.

1886—St. Ignatius College, Cleveland, Ohio was established, and St. Mary's parish taken over. (In 1925 the name was changed to John Carroll University.)
St. Francis Mission was begun among the Sioux Indians of South Dakota.

1887—Holy Rosary Mission was established among the Sioux Indians in South Dakota.

1888—A novitiate was opened in Prairie du Chien, Wisconsin.

1898—The novitiate was transferred to Cleveland (Parma) and a philosophate opened in Prairie du Chien.
St. John's College was opened in Toledo, Ohio. A university charter was obtained in 1903. (The school was closed in 1936.)

1907—After 38 years of mostly pioneer work the Buffalo Mission was broken up on September 1st. Its territory and its 321 members — 126 priests, 98 scholastics, 97 brothers — were divided between the Missouri and Maryland - New York Provinces.

* * * *

St. Michael's and St. Ann's parishes in Buffalo had been established by Jesuits of the Canada - New York Mission in 1851 and 1858.

* * * *

St. Stephen's Mission (Indian) in Wyoming was undertaken in 1884 by Fr. John Jutz, of the Buffalo Mission, but handed over in 1885 to the Missouri Province.

* * * *

Holy Trinity parish in Boston was staffed for many years by the Buffalo Mission.

List of Survivors of The Buffalo Mission

(Disbanded in 1907)

Name	*Born*	*Entered S. J.*	*Ordained*	*Residence*
Fr. Anthony H. Corey, S.J.	July 25, 1883	Jan. 6, 1906	June 27, 1920	St. Boniface, Wisconsin
Fr. Henry J. Hagen, S.J.	Mar. 13, 1881	Aug. 31, 1897	June 28, 1913	Shrub Oak, New York
Fr. Joseph F. Kiefer, S.J.	Jan. 3, 1884	Aug. 31, 1901	June 28, 1916	Florissant, Missouri
Fr. John G. Krost, S.J.	Nov. 21, 1884	Aug. 31, 1903	May 18, 1918	Loyola Academy, Wilmette, Illinois
Fr. James J. Mertz, S.J.*	May 24, 1882	Aug. 31, 1900	June 30, 1915	Loyola University, Chicago, Illinois
Fr. Louis J. Puhl, S.J.	Jan. 5, 1888	Aug. 31, 1905	June 27, 1920	Colombiere College, Detroit, Michigan
Fr. Henry H. Regnet, S.J.*	June 13, 1888	Aug. 31, 1905		Florissant, Missouri
Bro. Albert J. Schell, S.J.	Dec. 11, 1880	Apr. 16, 1901	June 27, 1920	Florissant, Missouri
Fr. Peter J. Scherer, S.J.	July 14, 1884	Aug. 31, 1905	June 27, 1920	University of Detroit, Detroit, Michigan
Fr. Augustine F. Siebauer, S.J.	Oct. 18, 1880	Sept. 4, 1899	June 26, 1914	Prairie du Chien, Wisconsin
Fr. Augustine C. Wand, S.J.	Nov. 13, 1883	Aug. 31, 1903	May 18, 1918	Florissant, Missouri
Fr. Edgar J. Zurlinden, S.J.	Mar. 22, 1887	Aug. 31, 1905	June 27, 1920	John Carroll University, Cleveland, Ohio

* Were able to attend Historical Celebration in July 1969 at St. Michael's Church, Buffalo, New York.

(III)

Letter from the German Provincials on the Occasion of the Centennial

Reverend Fathers and dear Brothers:

We German Provincials, too, remember with gratitude and joy the day on which, one hundred years ago, the Buffalo Mission was established to extend pastoral assistance to German-speaking Catholics in North America.

From about 1840 individual fathers and brothers of the German Province were recruited as missionaries in the Maryland Province. The best-known among them was the Swiss Fr. Ignatius Brocard, who had guided the German Province 1836-39, and was named Provincial of Maryland in 1848.

It was the banishment of the Society from Switzerland in 1847, however, that led a greater number of "German" Jesuits to North America. Thus, on June 4, 1848, 45 Jesuits boarded the "Providence," a transport-sailing vessel with meager accommodations for passengers, at Antwerp, and after a painful voyage of 46 days landed in New York. One of these emigrants was the later General, Anthony M. Anderledy, who completed his theological studies in St. Louis and was ordained to the priesthood there on September 29, 1848.

The Austrian Province also sent fathers and brothers, among them the parish-missioner and writer, Fr. F. X. Weninger, destined to exercise a fruitful apostolate for four decades.

Since political conditions in Europe changed rapidly, and the German States were ready to admit Jesuits, many emigrants were recalled. Yet, in 1853, when Fr. Peter Beck assumed the government of the Society, 27 fathers and six brothers of the German Province were still active in North America. Fr. Beck granted permission to all who wished to join one of the two American Provinces. Eighteen fathers and five brothers availed themselves of this permission. In subsequent years only few individuals went to North America, because the fathers and brothers were needed in the newly opened houses in Germany.

A change occurred in 1869. In an effort to organize the pastoral care of German-speaking immigrants (in the U. S.) more effectively, the Buffalo Mission was established on July 4, 1869. At its founding it numbered 13 fathers and 8 brothers in the small residences at St. Ann's and St. Michael's in Buffalo, N.Y. and St. Mary's in Toledo, Ohio.

The decree of expulsion of the Jesuits from the German Empire became a blessing for the Buffalo Mission. In the single year 1872, eighteen German Jesuits came to North America, followed by others year after year. Only a decade after the Mission was established, it numbered 107 members in two colleges and five residences—among them 37 brothers.

In 1884 the first Jesuits of the Buffalo Mission entered the Indian reservations in South Dakota. Here numerous German brothers and others of German descent have done outstanding missionary work.

In 1888 the Mission was able to open its own novitiate at Prairie du Chien, Wisconsin.

In 1893 it counted exactly 200 members in three colleges and five residences. Of these 79 were brothers, 22 in the Indian reservations of South Dakota.

A further notable increase occurred at the turn of the century. In the years 1898 and 1902 fifteen young Jesuits in each instance emigrated to North America; in 1903 the number even reached eighteen. After that date, however, the additions from the mother-province practically ceased. In its place the supply of youthful recruits from the U.S. enjoyed a happy increase.

On September 1, 1907 the Buffalo Mission was dissolved: 126 fathers, 98 scholastics, and 97 brothers—a total of 321—were dissociated from the German Province. In all, approximately 590 Jesuits: 430 fathers and scholastics and 160 brothers, had been members of the "Missio Germanica Americae Septentrionalis." Of these, 137 fathers and scholastics and 53 brothers had entered the Society in North America itself.

From the European houses of the German Province about 400 young Jesuits came to North America after the middle of the nineteenth century, with the purpose of working among German-speaking Catholics. They numbered 293 fathers and scholastics and 107

brothers. For the most part the missionaries soon founded schools which originally were meant for German boys, but gradually became fully Americanized. Some of the teachers in these schools also became known in Germany, e.g., Louis Bonvin through his German hymnal, and Fr. Francis Betten as translator of Fr. Finn's boys' stories.

Of these 400 Jesuits eighteen fathers and brothers later went to the Bombay Mission in India, while seven priests went to South America; 110 fathers and scholastics and 31 brothers returned to Europe, or left the Society.

It must never be forgotten that many of the fathers (in the U.S.) rendered inestimable services to their native country during the poverty-plagued years in the aftermath of two world wars. Fr. Constantine Kempf, Rector of St. Ignatius College, Valkenburg, records that after the first world war Fr. Theodore Hegemann was an outstanding benefactor of the German Provinces. During parish missions he called his audiences' attention to the fact that they could aid the German Jesuits by sending Mass offerings. Rev. George Eisenbacher, a diocesan priest in Chicago, collected the Mass stipends and forwarded them to Valkenburg. Other Fathers were similarly helpful. "Without this aid," Fr. Kempf remarks, "we couldn't have survived." Likewise, after World War II Fr. Gustave Reinsch, Fr. Joseph Wels, and Fr. Joseph Weis were noteworthy for repeatedly sending us very valuable packages of supplies.

When Fr. General Janssens established the Buffalo Province in 1960, he stated explicitly that the name was chosen in memory of the former Buffalo Mission.

The "mustard seed" sown one hundred years ago developed into an "imposing tree." We German Provincials rejoice with you, dear fathers and brothers, veterans and jubilarians, because of the blessing the Lord bestowed on this undertaking. And so we wish you a happy feastday and the grace of Christ for the future.

In cordial union,

P. Heinrich Ostermann S.J.
Praep. Prov. Germ. Inf.

P. Gunter Soballa S.J.
Praep. Prov. Germ. Or.

P. Heinrich Krauss S.J.
Praep. Prov. Germ. Sup.

I. Schasching S.J.

Munich, June 21, 1969.

(IV)

Sermon Preached by Francis X. Curran, S.J., at Centenary Celebation: July 13, 1969

Leave your country, your family, and your father's house, for the land I will show you. I will make you a great nation; I will bless you. (*Gn 12:1-2*)

On this occasion, we must gratefully acknowledge we are the children, the heirs, the possessors of a splendid inheritance — the Catholic church in the United States: of all the national churches in the world, one of the most numerous, most generous, most faithful.

Who built this church? Regrettably we, who benefit from the builders, do not know their names. We cannot identify the workers who laid the foundations, erected the great walls, pitched the towering roof. We look about us and ask: Who put up that pillar? who placed that statue? who erected that altar? And we can name no names.

All we know is that year after year, most notably in the last century, scores, thousands, millions of immigrants sought our shores, bringing with them only the strong backs that made them welcome to the inhabitants and an even stronger faith that made them pleasing to God. These Christians wanted their churches, their sacraments, their Mass. The American Church, overwhelmed by the mounting flood and unable to cope with strange customs and new languages, appealed for help to the churches of Europe. And those churches responded.

To assist the immigrants in building their churches and to meet the financial needs of those priests and religious who volunteered to serve those immigrants, the laity in Europe organized: in France, the Society for the Propagation of the Faith, in Bavaria the Ludwigmissionsverein, in Austria the Leopoldinenstiftung. By the scores and by the hundred, the call to leave their country, their family and their father's house was heard and answered by priests and religious. From all over Europe they came; from Spain, France, Belgium, Holland, Poland, Ireland, Italy—and not least from the

German-speaking lands of Europe. Today we celebrate the centenary of the coming to the United States of one out of many groups — the Jesuits of Germany.

When on July 4, 1869, the vanguard of the German Jesuits entered the city of Buffalo, they may not have known they were not the first. They were carrying on in the footsteps of great German Jesuits. In the 17th century, the rim of Christendom was pushed north from Mexico into our Southwest. The pioneer was Eusebio Kino, born in an Austrian town; and his work was carried on by his Jesuit brethren with names like Sedelmayr, Grashofer, Keller.

In the British Colonies in the 18th century, thousands of Germans flocked to the hospitable shores of William Penn's colony on the Delaware River. The only priests in America at the time were Jesuits of the Province of England. These men appealed to their brethren in Germany, and their call was answered. In the years after 1740, ten German Jesuits came to America and served the infant church. To mention but one of them: Fr. Farmer organized the church in New Jersey and assembled the first Catholic congregations in the State of New York. His name was an alias; his true name was Ferdinand Steinmayer. When the diocese of New York was created in 1808, the first bishop was never able, due to the Napoleonic wars, to reach his diocese. The man who first ruled the diocese was the vicar general, the German Jesuit Anthony Kohlmann.

When the diocese of Buffalo was created in 1847, there were already a dozen German Jesuit volunteers at work in the United States. Most served German-language churches in the East and Midwest, but three were engaged in the Indian missions of the Rocky Mountains and Pacific Coast.

Persecution

And in the same year, events were happening in Europe that led to the sudden appearance in the United States of 88 German Jesuits. We American Catholics have never been properly grateful to those governments of Europe which persecuted the Church. Again and again anti-Catholic governments ordered the dissolution or expulsion of religious orders—and the American Church received substantial reinforcements of priests and religious. To speak only of the Jesuit order, it was the persecuting governments of France that assisted those Jesuits of the Province of France who were

creating the Jesuit Provinces of Canada, New Orleans and New York. In Italy the Risorgimento which ended the Papal States aided the Italian Jesuits who were building the Provinces of Oregon and California. And it was the Kulturkampf of Otto von Bismarck which guaranteed that the Buffalo Mission of the German Jesuits would be a success.

In 1847 the persecution broke out in what we would say was a most unlikely place—Switzerland. Here the civil War of the Sonderbund ended in the victory of the anti-Catholic party. The victors wrote into the Swiss constitution a clause forever banning from their state the Society of Jesus. And the Provincial of Germany sent most of his young men in their studies here. Soon they were recalled. But the American Church had profited. For a number volunteered to remain.

And in 1847 John Timon, first bishop of the new diocese of Buffalo, appealed to the Jesuits for assistance, in handling a problem Bishop John Hughes could not solve, an Apostolic Delegate, Archbishop Bedini, could not handle, and only the passage of time brought to a peaceful end. The problem: the trustees of the German Church of St. Louis. At the time, this area was part of the Jesuit jurisdiction known as the Mission of New York and Canada. Somehow the superior found two German Jesuits and in 1848 they arrived in Buffalo. Efforts of Bishop Timon to install them as pastors of St. Louis were rebuffed. In 1851, at the bishop's request, they organized the parish of St. Michael's. In 1858 a second parish, St. Ann's, was begun.

Somehow enough German speaking priests were found to keep the two parishes going—but just barely. Finally, as the decade of the 1860's drew to a close, the American Jesuits once again appealed to their brethren in Germany, and once more the Macedonian cry drew a response, and a most generous one. In the last six months of 1869, eighteen German Jesuits arrived in Buffalo. Within two years their number had increased to 33.

The Buffalo Mission of the German Jesuits was in being. Clearly it aimed to serve the American Church, and not only in Buffalo. Within a few years, the fathers staffed German-speaking parishes in Toledo and Cleveland, Prairie du Chien in Wisconsin, Burlington in Iowa, Mankato in Minnesota. Mission bands were created and

they preached parish missions in German congregations throughout the East and Midwest. Other fathers turned to preach the faith to the original Americans; missions were begun—and they still continue—among the Sioux Indians on the Rosebud and Pine Ridge Reservations in South Dakota.

And being Jesuits, of course the German fathers turned to education. Most of their parishes, of course, had parochial schools. Indeed, in 1900 St. Ann's School with 2,100 pupils was one of the largest parochial schools in America. Yet the major predeliction of the fathers was the higher education of boys and young men. In 1870, here in Buffalo, the first classes were begun in what are now Canisius College and Canisius High School, which next year will celebrate their centenary. Within a few years, other colleges were begun in Prairie du Chien, Toledo and Cleveland. The latter school is now John Carroll University.

Clearly these German fathers appealed to American boys. When in 1907 the Buffalo Mission was ended, of the 275 members of the Mission in America, 120 were native born Americans.

It was recognized, even before the German Mission was begun, that it would be a temporary thing. The aim of any foreign mission is to destroy itself, so to root the faith in the soil that it becomes native to that soil, to make the new church so strong that it can take care of its own needs. Early in the present century it was seen that needs served so generously by the German Jesuits could now be safely turned over to native priests. In 1907, then, the jurisdiction of the Province of Germany over the Buffalo Mission was ended, and the mission members joined other Jesuit jurisdictions. The overwhelming majority of the German fathers remained in America to spend their remaining years in serving the Church they had served so well. Well indeed had they served it. These careful, laborious workers had built well. Practically every one of their works still survives and serves the church. Their names are forgotten by men, but they are writ large in the book of life. They left their country, their family and their father's house for the land that God showed them. God did indeed bless them and, through them, us. God has made us a great nation, in the greatness of His Church to which the Buffalo Mission of the German Jesuits made no small contribution.

B7814